Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ALVIN BALDUS, CARLENE BECHEN, ELVIRA
BUMPUS, RONALD BIENDSEIL, LESLIE W.
DAVIS, III, BRETT ECKSTEIN, GLORIA
ROGERS, RICHARD KRESBACH, ROCHELLE
MOORE, AMY RISSEEUW, JUDY ROBSON, JEANNE
SANCHEZ-BELL, CECELIA SCHLIEPP, TRAVIS
THYSSEN, CINDY BARBERA, RON BOONE, VERA
BOONE, EVANJELINA CLEERMAN, SHEILA
COCHRAN, MAXINE HOUGH, CLARENCE JOHNSON,
RICHARD LANGE, and GLADYS MANZANET,
Plaintiffs Case No. 11-CV-562

Plaintiffs, Case No. 11-CV-562 TAMMY BALDWIN, GWENDOLYNNE MOORE and RONALD KIND,

Intervenor-Plaintiffs,

v.

Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity; MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE,

(caption continued on next page)
VIDEO DEPOSTION OF
JAMES R. TROUPIS
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
February 22, 2012

Michelle Hagen Registered Professional Reporter

	Page 2		Page
	•	1	
	and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government	1	INDEX
	Accountability Board,	2	WITNESS EXAMINATION PAGE
	Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E.	3	JAMES R. TROUPIS By Mr. Earle
	PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J.	4	By Mr. Poland 158
	RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY,	5	By Mr. Hodan 212
	Intervenor-Defendants.	6	By Mr. Poland 264
	VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO	7	By Mr. Earle 269
	VARA, OLGA VARA, JOSE PEREZ, and	8	EXHIBITS
	ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs,	9	EXHIBIT NO.: MARKED ID'D
	Case No. 11-CV-1011	10	219 Letter, Troupis to McLeod14 14
	v. Members of the Wisconsin Government	11	220 Engagement letter38 38
	Accountability Board, each only in his	12	221 E-mail 77
	official capacity; MICHAEL BRENNAN,	13	222 E-mail, 7/12/1181 81
	DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE,	14	223 E-mail chain83 83
1	and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General	15	224 E-mail, 7/13/1185 85
	Counsel for the Wisconsin Government	16	225 12/14/10 document158 15
	Accountability Board,	17	226 E-mail chain170 170
	Defendants.	18	227 E-mail chain175 175
1		19	228 E-mail chain178 179
		20	229 E-mail184 184
1	VIDEO DEPOSITION of JAMES R. TROUPIS,	21	230 E-mail187 188
	taken at the instance of the Plaintiffs, under and pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil	22	231 E-mail193 193
	Procedure and the acts amended, before me, MICHELLE	23	232 E-mail chain205 205
	HAGEN, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public	24	233 Sealed exhibit264 265
	in and for the State of Wisconsin, at Godfrey & Kahn, S.C., 780 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on	25	234 E-mail chain273 274
	Page 3		Page
1	the 22nd day of February, 2012, commencing at 3:34	1	(The original exhibits were attached to the original
2	o'clock in the afternoon.	2	transcript.)
3	APPEARANCES	3	(The original transcript was sent to Mr. Earle.)
4	GODFEY & KAHN, S.C., 780 North Water	4	
5	Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DOUGLAS M.	5	
6	POLAND, appeared on behalf of the Baldus Plaintiffs.	6	
7	LAW OFFICES OF PETER EARLE, 839 North	7	
8	Jefferson Street, Suite 300, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202,	8	
9	by MR. PETER G. EARLE, appeared on behalf of the Voces de	9	
10	la Frontera Plaintiffs.	10	
11	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C.,	11	
12	1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	12	
13	53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E.	13	
14	FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants.	14	
15	WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	15	
16	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O.	16	
17	Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S.	17	
18	LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants.	18	
19	WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East	19	
20	Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by	20	
21	MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the	21	
22	Deponent.	22	
23	TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood	23	
24	Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR.	24	
	BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent.	25	
25			

		Page 6			Page 8
1		PROCEEDINGS	1		cycle. You only be experienced each ten years, so
2		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: My name is Steve	2		that's true.
3		Peters, CLVS associated with Halma-Jilek Reporting	3	Q	So you're familiar with the law that governs
4		Incorporated, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. This is the	4	Ψ.	redistricting?
5		beginning of the video deposition of James R.	5	A	Reasonably, yes, yes.
6		Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time, 3:34 p.m.	6	Q	Did you ever discuss with any of the legislative
7		This is the case concerning Alvin	7	•	aides or the legislators or the other attorneys
8		Baldus, et al., Plaintiffs, versus Members of the	8		involved in representing them
9		Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, et al.	9	A	A lot of people.
10		Defendants, case number 11-CV-562, pending in the	10	Q	the subject of the citizen voting age
11		United States District Court for the Eastern	11		population of the Latino community in Milwaukee?
12		District of Wisconsin; also the case of Voces de	12		MR. DAUGHTERY: Just for
13		la Frontera, Incorporated, et al., Plaintiffs,	13		clarification, at what point in time are you
14		versus Members of the Wisconsin Government	14		talking about here? At any time in history or
15		Accountability Board, et al. Defendants, case	15		MR. EARLE: At any time during the
16		number 11-CV-1011, pending in the United States	16		redistricting process related to Act 43.
17		District Court for the Eastern District of	17		THE WITNESS: Yes.
18		Wisconsin.	18	BY	MR. EARLE:
19		Will counsel now please state their	19	Q	And when did you have those discussions?
20		appearances. For the Plaintiffs.	20	A	I think you said citizen. You mean the
21		MR. EARLE: On behalf of the Voces de	21		question of citizenship and its relationship to
22		la Frontera Plaintiffs, Attorney Peter Earle.	22		the voting age population, that's your question.
23		MR. POLAND: On behalf of the Baldus	23		Okay. The first time I actually remember
24		Plaintiffs, Doug Poland.	24		discussing it at any length was after the process,
25		MR. HODAN: On behalf of the GAB	25		after the hearings in which I believe you raised
		Page 7			Page 9
1		Defendants, Attorney Patrick Hodan and Attorney	1		it, Peter, you know, at the hearings. It
2		Colleen Fielkow from the Reinhart Boerner law	2		certainly had been certainly talked about before,
3		firm.	3		but it wouldn't have been talked in any
4		MR. DAUGHTERY: On behalf of the	4		significant way until until until the
5		witness, Don Daughtery of Whyte Hirschboeck Dudek	5		hearing.
6		MR. LEWIS: On behalf of the witness,	6	Q	Okay, and so I just wanted to be clear about that.
7		Brandon Lewis of Troupis Law Office.	7		Prior to the hearing on July 13, 2011, no one on
8		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter	8		the legal team advising the legislature discussed
9		will now swear in the witness.	9		the question of Latino citizen voting age
10		JAMES R. TROUPIS, called as a witness	10		population percentages as they pertain to Assembly
11		herein by the Plaintiffs, after having been first	11		Districts 8 or 9; correct?
12		duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:	12		MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to form. Go
13		EXAMINATION	13		ahead and answer.
14		MR. EARLE:	14		THE WITNESS: I will need to say
15	Q	Welcome to this deposition, Mr. Troupis.	15		MR. EARLE: What's wrong with the
16		Good afternoon.	16		form?
17	Q	Am I is it correct to say that you are an	17		MR. DAUGHTERY: I think it's compound.
18		experienced election law lawyer?	18		MR. EARLE: Well, let's break it down.
19		Reasonable, I suppose.	19		THE WITNESS: Sure. I was a little
20	Q	Okay. You've been involved in a number of	20		concerned but there's certainly I'm aware of
		redistricting efforts; correct?	21		the issue.
21	_		22		MR. EARLE: And this may be a trial, a
22	A	Yes, I have. Yes, I have.			
22 23	A Q	So it's also accurate to say that you are an	23		deposition that's used at trial.
22 23 24	Q	So it's also accurate to say that you are an experienced redistricting lawyer?	23 24		deposition that's used at trial. THE WITNESS: That's fine, and I
22 23	Q	So it's also accurate to say that you are an	23		deposition that's used at trial.

		Page 10			Page 12
1	BY	MR. EARLE:	1		been a lot of discovery going on. These are the
2	0	So we don't want to have lingering form questions	2		only ones that I've looked at.
3		that are not resolved as we go. All right. So	3	Q	But they're all the e-mails you generated;
4		I'm going to ask you a question about Assembly	4		correct?
5		Districts 8 and 9 and the work you did as part of	5		MR. DAUGHTERY: Generated
6		the redistricting team related to Assembly	6		THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't
7		Districts 8 and 9.	7		think so. I mean, I assume there are other
8	A	Sure.	8		e-mails and the like that have been produced
9	Q	And the question is	9		during discovery. This related to the
10	A	And those are the new districts, the districts as	10		attorney-client privilege issues that had been
11		designated in the present Act 43.	11		raised and that's that's the only ones I've
12	Q	That's correct.	12		reviewed.
13	A	Okay.	13	BY	MR. EARLE:
14	Q	And so the question is whether you discussed the	14	Q	Okay. Well, we'll come back to this, okay, in
15		citizen voting age population of the Latino	15		more detail. I'm going to ask you some questions
16		community in the vicinity of those districts with	16		about your recordkeeping.
17		any member of the redistricting team prior to the	17	A	Certainly.
18		passage of Act 43.	18	Q	During the time that you participated in this
19	A	I don't recall any specific discussion. I just	19		redistricting process, what e-mail accounts did
20		simply don't recall it.	20		you use for work related to the redistricting
21	Q	Same question with regards to whether the Latino	21		process?
22		community constituted an effective voting majority	22	A	I would I would probably only have used my
23		in the vicinity of those districts?	23		office accounts as far as I know.
24	A	Well, we certainly discussed that.	24	Q	What e-mail address is that?
25	Q	And when did you discuss the question of an	25	A	Jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com.
1 2		Page 11 effective voting majority in Assembly Districts 8 and 9?	1 2	Q	Page 13 And did you did anybody at any point in time ask you to assemble all communications related to
3	A	Throughout the progress. There wouldn't be any	3		the redistricting process?
4	A	specific date that I'd remember because it was	4	A	No.
5		always a question that we would have been	5	0	Okay. Did you receive a letter from Attorney
6		concerned with or asked about in terms of those	6	Ą	McLeod asking you to assemble documents?
7		districts and the Latino population.	7	A	No.
8	Q	Did you generate any writings related to whether	8	Q	Did you ever provide Attorney McLeod with
9	•	there was an effective voting majority in the	9	•	documents?
10		Latino districts?	10	A	Yes.
11	A	There's a lot of I think there's a lot of	11	Q	How did you decide what documents to provide
12		e-mails and like that that discuss those sorts	12		Attorney McLeod with?
13		of issues but I don't recall offhand.	13	A	On, about January the 8th while I was preparing
14	Q	Now, you brought with you some documents today;	14		for another major trial, I received a phone call
15		correct?	15		from Mr. McLeod. I believe it was Mr. McLeod. It
16	A	Oh, yeah. The only thing I brought with me were	16		could have been is Ray Taffora, but in any event,
17		the documents that we submitted last night to the	17		you know, I it was ultimately from Eric and
18		Court, so that's whatever.	18		informing
19		MR. DAUGHTERY: JRT, Bate stamped JRT	19	Q	Keep going. I'm sorry.
20		1 through 127.	20	A	He simply he had described to me that an order
21	BY	MR. EARLE:	21		had been entered and he asked me to gather
22	Q	And they represent all the documents that are	22		communications related to third parties that I had
23		related to you that are part of this discovery	23		discussions with.
24		process?	24	Q	So did he ask and that was not so you
25	A	I don't have a clue, because there's apparently	25		received nothing in writing?
20					

		Page 14			Page 16
1	A	I received nothing. Well, I mean	1		people that are listed here. That's what I did.
2	Q	It's my understanding that you received something	2	Q	So did you produce documents relative to your
3		in writing and I was informed by	3		contacts with Eric McLeod?
4	A	No.	4	A	No. That was not what I was requested to do.
5		MR. DAUGHTERY: No, no. There's a	5	Q	Do you have documents in your possession
6		letter that you wrote back.	6		related that relative where you're
7		THE WITNESS: I wrote a letter back.	7		communicating with Eric McLeod about the
8		I apologize. I did write a letter in response to	8		redistricting process?
9		the that oral request and discussion that had	9	A	Certainly. Certainly.
10		been that memorializes those discussions and	10	Q	And it's your testimony here today that you did
11		what I was providing to Mr. McLeod, who at that	11		not produce those documents?
12		so that's I did do that.	12	A	I didn't because he would presumably have had
13		MR. EARLE: May I see a copy of the	13		them, but I wasn't requested to, so I didn't.
14		letter please?	14	Q	And those documents included documents that
15		THE WITNESS: Certainly.	15		contain political and/or strategic advice about
16		MR. EARLE: Can we mark it? Do you	16		the redistricting process; correct?
17		have another copy?	17	A	I wouldn't think so, but, you know, I don't know.
18		MR. DAUGHTERY: We've got several	18		I don't know because I didn't gather them.
19		copies here.	19	Q	Did you gather documents that you sent to
20		(Exhibit No. 219 was marked for	20	٠	Scott Fitzgerald about the redistricting process?
21		identification.)	21	A	I candidly don't know that I ever sent anything
22	BY	MR. EARLE:	22	**	directly to Scott Fitzgerald about the
23	Q	Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 219, car			redistricting process other than a letter, the
24	Ψ.	you identify it, please?	24		letter of retention, but no, I wasn't requested to
25	A	Yeah. This is the letter that I wrote that we've	25		do that.
		Page 15			Page 17
1		just been discussing that I wrote back to	1	Q	I notice that Scott Fitzgerald's name is not on
2		Mr. McLeod on January the 9th, but he had	2		this list of individuals with whom you
3		that pursuant to the discussions that we had on	3		corresponded and for whom you produced documents.
4		January the 8th.	4	A	This is an inclusive list as opposed to an
5	Q	I notice at the bottom of the first page you	5		exclusive list; that is, everyone included here I
6		indicate that that you did you withhold any	6		did the search that's noted on the letter. You
7		documents on the basis of privilege when you	7		may assume I did not look for people who are not
8		produced these documents?	8		on the list.
9	Α	No, I did not.	9	Q	So you are not prepared to certify to the Court
10	Q	Did you withhold any documents on the basis of	10	-	that you have provided all documents relative to
11	-	attorney work product potentially?	11		communications between you and Scott Fitzgerald
12	A	No, I did not.	12		about the redistricting process; is that correct?
13	Q	So it's your testimony here today and you would be	13	A	Presumably, presumably. Anything any contacts
14	-	confident certifying to the United States District	14		I had with any of the parties here would have
15		Court in this case that you have produced every	15		included would have been produced if they were
16		single document in your possession that is	16		to be produced. I haven't had any independent
17		responsive to the request you received from	17		I have no knowledge of an independent contact with
18		Mr. McLeod?	18		Scott Fitzgerald or Tad Ottman or Joe Handrick or
19	A	The requests that he made, it was responsive to	19		any of the various people that was not sent to
20	-	the requests he made, yes.	20		them or and/or copied to Mr. McLeod or
21	Q	And would you define as precisely as possible the	21		Mr. Taffora. So presumably they had all of that
22	٠	request that was made?	22		and have produced it. I have no knowledge what
23	A	Well, the letter tries to and if it doesn't, I	23		they did or didn't produce, but I know of no
24		apologize. I had been requested to gather	24		I know of nothing other than to those people
25		documents that related to my contacts with the	25		that that wouldn't have been a subject of this.
		•			·

Page 18 Page 20 So I've never been asked. 1 request to you, all we have is your reflection 1 2 Q You've never been asked. Okay. Now, Mr. Troupis, 2 upon it in Exhibit 219, you know, so we're going 3 3 to rely on your memory here. Okay? So did you in this case discovery has dribbled out and --4 4 Α I don't know that, but however you characterize search for communications between you and 5 it, Peter, is fine. 5 Scott Fitzgerald about the redistricting process? 6 And you and I are both experienced lawyers and you 6 That's the question. Would you like some water? O 7 7 No, I'm fine. I was just waiting for you to come are a collegial guy and as a result we tend to Α 8 fall into a conversational mode where we talk over 8 9 each other, which is normal --9 Q Continue. I can hear. 10 Α I apologize if I'm too formal -- if I'm not formal 10 Α As I think the record reflects, we searched all of 11 enough. 11 our files for the individuals noted in this 12 Q And poor Michelle sitting here has to take down 12 exhibit. I can, however, also say that in that 13 13 what we're saying. So we should try and constrain process I did search my files for anything related 14 ourselves. You know, as practitioners I know it's 14 to Scott or any other leaders simply because I was 15 15 looking for anything. It wasn't because hard for us to do when we ourselves are in the 16 chair, but maybe if you could try and do that, 16 Mr. McLeod had or hadn't requested it. So I did 17 that would be great. Okay, number one. 17 review all of our paper files. I also reviewed 18 And number two, discovery has been 18 all of our Word document, all our PDF documents, 19 19 very frustrating in this case, I'll represent that anything else contained on our servers that I 20 to you, because it's been very difficult to obtain 20 thought related to it at that -- at that time. 21 21 documents. The legislature, as characterized by So with regard to the majority leader, 22 the court, has been less than cooperative and less 22 I certainly did look and that's why I answered than forthright in producing the documents that 23 23 earlier that I didn't recall that there was any 24 have been sought. 24 direct communications at all between me and 25 25 Mr. Fitzgerald. There may have been. I just MR. HODAN: Is there a question? Page 21 Page 19 MR. EARLE: Wait. I'm finishing. don't remember any. Senator Fitzgerald. 1 1 BY MR. EARLE: 2 Q When you performed this search, you did so by way 3 3 O And so I'm putting that down as a context. I'm of word query? 4 simply trying to determine how close we are to the 4 Α Yes. We aren't that big an office, so it's fairly 5 point that we can have a certification that 5 simple. All of the -- all of these matters would 6 discovery is complete. So I'm going to ask you a 6 have subfiles easily, so that's what we did. We 7 7 actually searched all the files I had. series of questions. 8 Sure --8 Q And is one of the means the use of a word query? 9 9 Q -- very pointed questions about individuals and Α Right, yes. 10 whether or not documents relative to those 10 Q Did you use the word query Scott Fitzgerald? 11 individuals in the discovery process have been 11 Α I don't recall. 12 produced or not. Okay? So if you can constrain 12 As I understand Exhibit 219, you used word queries 13 13 related to the individuals listed on Exhibit 219; your answer, if you can constrain your answer to 14 that question, the questions as I phrase them 14 correct? 15 15 narrowly. Okay? Α Yes, I did. 16 MR. DAUGHTERY: And just to clarify, 16 And is it your testimony here today --17 when you say have been produced in litigation, 17 Α I may have used -- I want to be careful because I 18 have been produced by Mr. Troupis you're talking 18 may have used others in addition but I used these 19 19 about: right? at a minimum, yes. 20 MR. EARLE: Absolutely. 20 Q Okay. Are you prepared to certify here under oath THE WITNESS: I don't have any 21 21 today to the United States Circuit Court, District 22 22 knowledge about that. Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin that 23 BY MR. EARLE: 23 you have produced every document related to 24 So, you know, and since we don't have precision 24 communications between you and Scott Fitzgerald in 25 25 about how -- the way Eric McLeod characterized his the context of this redistricting process?

		Page 22			Page 24
1	A	I'm aware I'm under oath so you don't need to	1		documents in your possession regarding
2		remind me of that. My testimony is is what it is.	2		communications with those individuals have been
3		I searched accordingly and I've described exactly	3		provided to Eric McLeod for production in this
4		as I have searched. I haven't a clue what you	4		case?
5		mean by certified, but I did search the files as	5	A	I'd answer the same way as before. I mean, I
6		I've explained and did not find anything related	6		can't. First of all, I don't know what you mean
7		to the majority leader other than, you know, what	7		by certified, but I do know that what I provided
8		I've produced here.	8		to him and it's listed here. So I didn't provide
9	0	Have you produced every document related to	9		him anything with regard to those other
10	Q	communications between you and Robin Vos with	10		individuals, whether I had it or not.
11		regards to the redistricting process?	11	O	Okay. So the answer to the question about these
12	A	Peter, I don't mean to belabor this. I haven't	12	Q	individuals, Scott Fitzgerald, Jeff Fitzgerald,
13	Α.	produced anything in this case. I haven't been	13		Senator Zipperer and Robin Vos, is that you don't
14		involved in this case. Mr. McLeod requested that	14		know whether all the documents in your possession
15		I provide certain things to him. I provided them	15		regarding communications about the redistricting
16		to him. So I haven't had any responsibility.	16		process have been produced to Eric McLeod for
17			17		disclosure to the Court in this case?
18		I have never seen a document request to my	18	A	Because I well, that's not what I said. I said
19		knowledge or otherwise in this case. What you have in front of you is what is the summary of	19	^	as to some of them that I believed I had, that
20		what I produced.	20		there were none, and as to the others that
21	0	Do you have in your possession any documents	21		Mr. McLeod presumably would have them because any
22	Q	J J 1	22		· '
		reflecting communications between you and	23		communication I had he was copied on, so he would have it.
23		Robin Vos about the redistricting process?	24		
24	A	I can say that I did look at, again, as I was			But in the course of this inquiry, the
25		looking at the majority leader, as I told you, no,	25		one you're asking about now on January the 8th and
		Page 23			Page 25
1		it was not requested, and I do not recall any	1		January the 9th, I did not provide him any
2		direct communications of any sort with Robin Vos.	2		additional documents, other than other than the
3	Q	How about with Senator Zipperer?	3		ones I'm referring to here.
4	A	Senator Zipperer may have been copied on certain	4	Q	Did Eric McLeod ever come back to you after
5		communications. My recollection is that he may	5		January 9th and ask you to search for further
6		have been, maybe even some of the ones here.	6		documents?
7		Other than that I didn't make any inquiry into	7	A	No.
8		Senator Zipperer, so I don't know.	8	Q	Did Eric McLeod ever come back to you after
9	Q	During the redistricting process, did you	9		January 9 and ask you whether you were sure you
10		communicate with Senator Zipperer?	10		had produced all responsive documents to his
11	A	We spoke regularly.	11		earlier request?
12	Q	Did you correspond electronically with him?	12	A	No.
13	A	I don't recall that I did. That's why I said that	13	Q	Did you discuss the redistricting process with
14		a minute ago. I just don't don't recall that I	14		Scott Walker?
15		had, but I may have. That's what I'm saying.	15	A	Scott Walker, in this redistricting process,
16		I just don't recall.	16		because he was supposed to be the primary witness
17	Q	What about representative Jeff Fitzgerald?	17		in 2002 in that redistricting process and then he
18	A	The speaker would fall in the same category as the	18		ran for county executive and I lost him as a
19		majority leader. It would have been rare and I do	19		witness right before the trial. So I am sure over
20		not recall any direct communication with him other	20		time I have had discussions with the governor but
21		than the letter of retention, by e-mail or	21		not since he's been governor.
22		otherwise.	22	Q	Okay. Well, that's actually I thank you for
23	Q	So I guess I'm going to ask you the same question	23		that because I was I intended to ask you only
24		as I have about prior individuals. Are you	24		about this redistricting process.
		prepared to certify to the Court that all	25	A	That's why I did that for you, Peter.
25		prepared to certify to the Court that an	20		111111 5 Willy 1 und tillut 101 you, 1 0to1.

		Page 26			Page 28
1	Q	I appreciate that.	1		As I understand it, Michael Best was retained by
2	A	No, I have not spoken to the governor since he has	2		the leaders, the respective leaders of the
3		been elected governor in any respect with regard	3		assembly and the senate; correct?
4		to redistricting.	4	A	Yes, they were.
5	Q	Okay. Could you identify everybody that you spoke	5	0	And there was a retainer agreement between
6	·	to who's an elected official in the legislature	6	Y	Michael Best and the majority leader on behalf of
7		with whom you spoke, with whom you discussed this	7		the legislature; correct?
8		redistricting process?	8	A	I believe so, yes.
9	A	I don't think I could. I don't think I could	9	Q	And on behalf of the speaker and that respective
10		accurately. You know, I had I've had no	10		chamber.
11		direct well, I don't know. I mean, because	11	A	I would assume so, yes.
12		because, for example, I've appeared at the	12	O	And showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 198
13		caucuses, and so, you know, various of the hundred	13		MR. DAUGHTERY: Do you have a copy
14		plus members would have asked questions or not,	14		I can use? Great, thank you.
15		and I mean, I I wouldn't I couldn't	15	BY	MR. EARLE:
16		accurately tell you that. I don't know.	16	Q	This is an exhibit that's been in this case.
17	Q	When you say you appeared at the caucuses, what do	17	A	Okay.
18	-	you mean by that?	18	Q	Have you ever seen this before?
19	A	Well, there's some e-mails here that indicate that	19	A	Don't recall seeing this before. I must have
20		there were caucus meetings where I would appear	20		because I see that I see that under separate
21		and answer questions or queries that the caucus	21		counsel I'm we're listed, Troupis Law Office.
22		members might have had.	22		I just I don't remember the letter, that's what
23	Q	And these were meetings of the Republican caucus	23		I'm saying.
24		you're addressing, you're referring to?	24	Q	So what is your testimony then? You don't
25	A	Yes, yes.	25		remember the letter, you may have seen it?
		Page 27			Page 29
1	Q	And who called those meetings?	1	A	That's pretty close to what my testimony is.
2	A	I don't know. I assume the majority leader or the	2		I just I mean, I would be surprised as I look
3		speaker.	3		at it that I hadn't seen it, but honestly, I don't
4	Q	And where were those meetings held?	4		remember. I don't remember seeing this. So if
5	A	In the caucus chambers for the assembly and	5		I did, I did.
6		senate.	6	Q	Did you sign a separate retainer agreement with
7	Q	Did you also meet with legislators separate and	7		Michael Best?
		apart from those meetings over at the law offices	8	A	Yes.
8		of Michael Best?	9	Q	Do you have a copy of that with you?
8 9	A	No. Other than other than there were two	10	A	No, I don't.
9		meetings in June, early in June and late in June	11	Q	When did you enter into that separate retainer
9 10		meetings in June, early in June and late in June with what I would call the leaders, either the	11 12	Q	When did you enter into that separate retainer agreement with Michael Best?
9 10 11				Q A	•
9 10 11 12		with what I would call the leaders, either the	12		agreement with Michael Best?
9 10 11 12 13		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know	12 13		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a
9 10 11 12 13 14		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer.	12 13 14		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a
9 10 11 12 13 14 15		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might	12 13 14 15		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of	12 13 14 15 16		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers.	12 13 14 15 16 17		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected	12 13 14 15 16 17 18		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected in some of these e-mails, did occur over at	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator the senator and the speaker that reflected how
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected in some of these e-mails, did occur over at Michael Best's offices. Other than that, I	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator the senator and the speaker that reflected how how that relationship was. You would know better
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected in some of these e-mails, did occur over at Michael Best's offices. Other than that, I honestly don't recall other meetings, although	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator the senator and the speaker that reflected how how that relationship was. You would know better than I. If you've got it, you've got it. I just
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected in some of these e-mails, did occur over at Michael Best's offices. Other than that, I honestly don't recall other meetings, although maybe there's an e-mail or something that would	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator the senator and the speaker that reflected how how that relationship was. You would know better than I. If you've got it, you've got it. I just don't remember. I don't remember the nature of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	with what I would call the leaders, either the speaker, the majority leader, Vos. I don't know what his official title is. Senator Zipperer. There might have been Assemblyman Suder might have been involved. Those are all the leaders of the two the two chambers. So those meetings, which are reflected in some of these e-mails, did occur over at Michael Best's offices. Other than that, I honestly don't recall other meetings, although maybe there's an e-mail or something that would remind me.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		agreement with Michael Best? I recall it was about this same time. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Is there a letter did we have a retention agreement directly again, I haven't looked at this in a very long time. We may have had a direct letter because of the privilege issues with senator the senator and the speaker that reflected how how that relationship was. You would know better than I. If you've got it, you've got it. I just don't remember. I don't remember the nature of the way the retention went forward. I just was

		Page 30			Page 32
1	Q	So I Mr. Troupis, I don't understand what you	1	A	\$375 an hour.
2		just testified to.	2	O	And how much have you been paid as a result of
3	A	Well, what I'm saying is I don't remember the	3		this redistricting process?
4		sequence of events. I do remember around this	4	A	I checked that before I came over here just to
5		time period in January or February that we	5		see. Somewhere between 40 and \$50,000.
6		entered we would presumably we would have	6	Q	Okay. That's your total billing for the
7		had a letter of retention entered into at about	7		redistricting?
8		the same time and that we were to be paid out of a	8	A	Yes.
9		trust. That's why you're hearing all this	9	0	And when was the last billing?
10		hesitation on my part, is that Michael Best pays	10	A	I believe it was August the 6th was the last time
11		us. I don't get paid by the speaker, majority	11		we have had any involvement at all. It was right
12		leader or the state. I'm paid by Michael Best.	12		after the just at about the time that the
13		So without those letters in front of me, I don't	13		governor signed the bill. My my involvement
14		remember how that retention occurred.	14		ended with the completion of the legislative
15	O	What was the mechanism by which you were paid by	15		process.
16	Q	Michael Best?	16	O	Did you provide any advice with regards to how
17	Δ	We would submit regular invoices to Michael Best	17	Q	Joe Handrick's time should be billed?
18	^	and then they would approve them and seek the	18	A	I helped negotiate the arrangement with Joe. We
19		they would review them presumably and then approve	19		go back a long way. He'd been involved in the
20		them and then the they had some arrangement	20		1990's and again in 2000 and we've stayed I will
21		with the speaker and the majority leader where	21		say close friends. So so when Joe went to the
22		they would approve them or if they didn't approve	22		Reinhart law firm, you know, it was really
23		them we presumably we were automatically paid.	23		important, I thought, given his lengthy experience
24		So we would be paid during the month following our	24		that he participate.
25		billing based on that process out of the trust	25		So there's so that I just say that
23		bining based on that process out of the trust	23		so there's so that I just say that
		Page 31			Page 33
1		account of Michael Best & Friedrich.	1		just to let you know that yes, I was involved with
2	Q	So you were paid on the basis of a written	2		Joe in terms of negotiating whatever and there was
3		invoice?	3		a number of proposals going back and forth and
4	A	Yes.	4		eventually the majority leader and speaker chose
5	Q	And what was the format of this written invoice?	5		an arrangement where he was paid on a monthly
6	A	It was very simple. It simply reflected the	6		basis a single amount as a retainer or a payment
7		amount of the hours, the dates on which services	7		as I recall.
8		were provided, and the total.	8	Q	Were you involved in any decision to that to
9	Q	Did it include did it include any descriptors	9		the effect that Joe Handrick's billings, invoices
10		of the services that were provided?	10		should not reflect the substance of what he was
11	A	Not that I recall.	11		doing on a as he was working?
12	Q	Was that was there an agreement by which you	12	A	You know, fairly interpreting your question,
13	-	could omit a descriptor, what it was you were	13		I think that's right. I mean, I think that, yeah,
14		doing?	14		yes.
15	A	Well, no one ever asked for it, so I suppose	15	Q	And you did that because you didn't want it to be
16		that's an agreement.	16	-	known you didn't want a paper trail, if you
17	Q	So it would simply list the number of hours for	17		will, as to what it was that Joe Handrick was
18	٠	the month or on a daily basis?	18		doing in the redistricting process; isn't that
19	A	For the month. It just indicates the days on	19		correct, sir?
20		which services are provided and the total hours	20	A	No, despite your conspiracy theories. The reason
21		and the total amount due.	21		for it was and again, there may be e-mails to
22	Q	Okay. And	22		this effect with the majority leader and speaker.
23	A	It may also have costs. If there were some costs	23		Again, I don't remember how it all transpired, but
24		incurred, that may be on there also.	24		if Joe had to write everything down and all the
25	Q	And at what rate were you compensated?	25		stuff he was doing and he had to bill it,
	·	 			2,

		Page 34			Page 36
1		I believe that the majority leader and speaker	1		remember that, but I I don't believe I made a
2		believed it would be a lot bigger bill.	2		recommendation. I was kind of either way. It
3		And so they believed, given Joe's	3		didn't matter.
4		candid knowledge and honesty and desire to be	4	O	And the contract with Reinhart's contract, who
5		involved in the process, that they were better off	5		was the other party to the contract that Reinhart
6		having essentially an unlimited engagement for	6		entered into?
7		Mr. Handrick, and I did not disagree with that,	7	A	I'd have to have the contract. Just as with the
8		that his that candidly the amount of hours and	8		retainer letter that we just talked about a minute
9		the effort that he would put in would far exceed	9		ago from my law firm, I don't know whether the
10		the amount of his monthly retainer and that it was	10		contract was directly with the speaker and the
11		better to do it that way. So I went along with it	11		majority leader or whether it was with
12		but it was mostly because I knew that it would be	12		Michael Best. I just don't remember.
13		much more expensive if he had gone the other way.	13	Q	Okay. We'll pull it out.
14	Q	But it was your suggestion that his his time	14	A.	If you've got it, it would be easier to just show
15	Q	reports not include	15	^	it to me. That's fine. My memory may not be what
16	A	No.	16		it once was.
17	Q	a descriptor of his work; isn't that true?	17	Q	I assure you mine is not.
	Ą A	•	18	Ą A	
19	A	I don't recall ever making that recommendation on the I don't recall that at all. I recall	19		Well, you know, we're of a certain age, Peter.
1			20	Q	I'll match my deterioration rate to anybody's.
20		simply that I agreed with the decision of the		A	As I told you before, coming off, you know, a
21		speaker and the majority leader that that was a	21		six-month ordeal and one of the longest trials
22		wise use of their funds. I didn't I don't know	22		I've ever been involved in, I could tell you
23		that I ever made a recommendation one way or the	23		that's certainly where I'm at at the moment.
24		other than what I've just testified to.	24	Q	With your outcome, I would imagine that would help
25	Q	Did you negotiate the agreement with the Reinhart	25		restore a lot of your memory.
		Page 35			Page 37
1		law firm for Joe's services?	1	A	I don't need the memory.
2	A	I wouldn't say I negotiated it but I was involved.	2	Q	Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 6 to the
3		Don Millis represented the law firm in that,	3	-	Handrick deposition.
4		Reinhart, and there were a number of	4	A	Oh, okay. So let's see what Joe said about it.
5		communications back and forth about what would	5	O	You've seen this document before?
6		work and what wouldn't work and what was advisable	6	A	I'm sure that I did. I don't remember right now
7		and what wasn't, but I so that's as much as	7		but I'm sure I did. Yeah, I was cc'd on it so
8		I remember. And again, you may have documents	8		I know that I was.
9		about this. I just don't remember it other than	9	Q	And this is a follow-up letter concerning the
10		as I've described.	10	٠	engagement; right?
11	Q	But the contract was with the Reinhart law firm;	11	A	Yeah, this is the this is the engagement we've
12	·	correct?	12	-	been discussing.
13	A	I believe so.	13	Q	Okay. And this indicates that the engagement is
l	Q	Did you review the contract with the Reinhart law	14	~	by Michael Best & Friedrich and Reinhart Boerner
14	~	firm prior to it being approved?	15		Van Deuren; correct?
14 15		mm prior to it being approved.		A	Yes, that appears to be correct.
15	A	I probably did, yes. I don't remember but I	16		
15 16	A	I probably did, yes. I don't remember but I	16 17		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
15 16 17		probably did.	17	Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct?
15 16 17 18	A Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature	17 18	Q A	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is.
15 16 17 18 19	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm?	17 18 19	Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if
15 16 17 18 19 20		 probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do 	17 18 19 20	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do remember distinctly the discussion that I	17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection? Yeah. Okay.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do remember distinctly the discussion that I reflected on just a minute ago with regard to	17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection? Yeah. Okay. How would you characterize the scope of the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do remember distinctly the discussion that I reflected on just a minute ago with regard to whether it should be on an hourly basis or whether	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection? Yeah. Okay. How would you characterize the scope of the engagement between Michael Best & Friedrich and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do remember distinctly the discussion that I reflected on just a minute ago with regard to whether it should be on an hourly basis or whether there should be a retainer set and which would be	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection? Yeah. Okay. How would you characterize the scope of the engagement between Michael Best & Friedrich and Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren regarding the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	probably did. Did you make any recommendations about the nature of that contract with the Reinhart law firm? Actually I I don't remember but I I do remember distinctly the discussion that I reflected on just a minute ago with regard to whether it should be on an hourly basis or whether	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	And this is dated February 18, 2011; correct? Yes, it is. You want to take a moment and review it and see if it refreshes your recollection? Yeah. Okay. How would you characterize the scope of the engagement between Michael Best & Friedrich and

		Page 38			Page 40
1		MR. HODAN: Objection, calls for a	1		hesitated.
2		legal conclusion. Subject to that, go ahead.	2	O	With that caveat in mind, it's clear that the
3		THE WITNESS: I don't know because	3	Q	client on whose behalf the Reinhart law firm was
4		I don't have the engagement letter.	4		hired was the state legislature; correct?
5	BY	MR. EARLE:	5	A	That's what it appears to be. Well, not the state
6	Q	Would that help you?	6	•	legislature but, in fact, the the Wisconsin
7	A	Well, yeah. As I said, I don't know.	7		state senate by its majority leader
8	**	MR. EARLE: Let's mark that.	8		Scott Fitzgerald and the Wisconsin state assembly
9		(Exhibit No. 220 was marked for	9		by its speaker, Jeff Fitzgerald.
10		identification.)	10	Q	Those are the clients.
11	BY	MR. EARLE:	11	A	That's correct. They are who the clients are.
12	Q	Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 220.	12	Q	They are the Reinhart clients in the redistricting
13	A.	Thank you.	13	Q	process; correct?
14	Q	Would you take a moment and review that.	14	A	That's a fair statement. Yeah.
15	A.	Okay, I've reviewed it.	15	Q	Okay. I mean, you agree with that statement
16	Q	You're cc'd on this letter; correct?	16	Q	legally?
17	A.	Yes, yes, I am.	17	A	Yeah. Yeah, that's a fair statement. The
18	0	And the cc indicates there was a cc with	18	А	implication of it may not be fair, and that is
19	Q	enclosures; correct?	19		that Mr. Handrick, Joe, because he's not a partner
20	A	That's what it says.	20		in a law firm, you know, you can't my
21	Q	Okay. And and this is the engagement letter	21		understanding under the ethics code and the like
22	Q	where Michael Best hired the Reinhart law firm on	22		would not have allowed him to have a direct
23		behalf of the Wisconsin state senate by its	23		agreement. So he's paid by the Reinhart law firm.
24		majority leader, Scott Fitzgerald and the	24		He's not a lawyer. So there had to be a lawyer
25		Wisconsin state assembly by its speaker, Jeff	25		and a partner in the law firm sign the letter. So
20		wisconsin state assembly by its speaker, ben	20		and a partner in the law inim sign the letter. 50
		Page 39			Page 41
1		Fitzgerald; correct?	1		that's all I don't I don't know how Reinhart
2	A	Is that a statement? I don't know. I mean,	2		works, but my assumption, and that's why I was a
3		that's what it appears to be. I got copied on it	3		little surprised
4		but it certainly appears to be just what you	4	Q	Well, you don't need to speculate in a deposition,
5		described.	5		sir.
6	Q	Well, the question is is that an accurate	6	A	I'm not trying to, Peter. That's fine. I'm just
7		statement. You were copied you were part of a	7		trying to make sure that there's not a
8		negotiation, you said.	8		misunderstanding of why that would be the case.
9	A	Yes.	9	Q	The core of the question was to identify the
10	Q	All right. So is it an accurate statement that	10		client and the law firm and you've done that
11		this letter reflects the contract that between	11	A	Yes.
12		the Reinhart law firm and the Wisconsin state	12	Q	and you would like to speculate about other
13		legislature as arranged by the Michael Best &	13	-	aspects of it.
14		Friedrich law firm?	14	A	In fairness in fairness, I have no I have no
15	A	If you say so. The reason I'm hesitating is	15		ability to authenticate or otherwise address this
16		simply because as you point out, it says with	16		letter. I was copied on this letter. I was not
17		enclosures, and I have some recollection, and I	17		involved in writing it. I didn't write it. It
18		may be incorrect on this, that Reinhart does	18		was written by the parties involved and they were
19		include some additional materials vis-a-vis the	19		signing it. If your objective was to have me
20		relationships and the firms, and I'm also so	20		authenticate it, I can't. I got a copy of it.
21		that was that was the reason I was hesitating.	21		That's all I know. So I'm trying to be as honest
22		It certainly appears to memorialize an	22		with you as I can.
23		understanding and agreement consistent with what	23	Q	That's good.
24		I've just testified to, but there may be other	24	A	That's
25		piece there may be more to it. That's why I	25	Q	I appreciate you trying to be as honest as you
L					· · · · · ·

Page 42 Page 44 that context, well, you know, if you're retained can. That's the most we can expect under these 1 1 2 2 by the Republican leader or the Republican circumstances. 3 3 minority leader, for example, who's your client. Α Sure. 4 Q You, in fact, received it. 4 And so that is why I was as careful as I was. So I assume I did. It says cc'd, so --5 Α 5 it goes back two decades in dealings with the 6 Okay. And -- and it's a true and accurate copy of 6 legislature and how that -- how that would be 7 7 dealt with. the letter you received; correct? 8 8 I don't have any independent recollection of it And I know that there's, for example, 9 9 but I have no reason to doubt that it is. been discussions over the years, I remembered this Okay. 10 Q 10 from the 2000 cycle, where various members of the other party, for example, would send a letter and 11 Α It is not a true and accurate -- it's a copy of a 11 12 letter but there were enclosures. So it's not a 12 say you represent me. And, you know, if I was 13 13 true and accurate copy of everything that was representing the then speaker or the majority 14 14 leader at the time, my attitude was no, I don't, 15 15 Q but that's why I was very careful. I try to be It's not a complete. 16 Α That's fair. 16 careful in that respect. 17 Ω Okay. Do you have the original? Okay. When did 17 O It's not your position that Reinhart's client was 18 the contract -- is the contract between the 18 the caucus; correct? 19 Reinhart law firm and the state legislature still 19 I'm sorry, I don't understand the question. 20 20 in effect today? 0 The -- when we -- when we have the words that 21 21 Reinhart's client was the Wisconsin state senate MR. DAUGHTERY: Object. I think he's 22 22 indicated he can't necessarily -- I think there's by its majority leader Scott Fitzgerald, the 23 a lack of foundation based on his prior testimony, 23 client of the Reinhart law firm was not the 24 but subject to that, go ahead and answer to the 24 Republican caucus of the legislature. 25 25 best of your ability. Α Correct. You asked me the history -- you asked me Page 45 Page 43 THE WITNESS: I don't know. There's a 1 1 why I was so precise, and I was simply explaining 2 2 provision in here, for example, that allows for there's a -- there's been a historical anomaly 3 termination at any time. I don't know whether 3 that began with the caucuses in the nineties and 4 it's terminated or not. As I told you, I hadn't, 4 then in the 2000 cycles that, you know, has arisen 5 practically speaking, been involved since August 5 from time to time, and I'm sure it's arisen on the 6 of last year. 6 other side as well. 7 BY MR. EARLE: 7 The Democrats, for example, you know, 8 8 Q I was curious, when you -- you qualified the they would often have counsel and this question 9 answer and I asked you to identify the client, I 9 might have -- I assume came up for them as well in 10 10 referred to the legislature and you qualified the that -- in the last ten years. So that's why 11 answer as the Wisconsin state senate by its 11 I was trying to be precise because there's --12 majority leader Scott Fitzgerald and the Wisconsin 12 because I don't know -- I'm not trying to say that 13 state assembly by its speaker Jeff Fitzgerald. 13 there's something beyond what's stated in the 14 14 letter as the client. Α 15 I appreciate the precision. Would you explain to 15 Okay. Well, let's just try to nail this down as 0 0 16 me what you mean by that. 16 clearly as we can. 17 Α Well, there's been -- there's been 17 Α Sure. 18 misunderstandings over the years going back to the 18 Q We have -- Reinhart has its client. It's 19 19 early 1990's about who and -- who is being basically the state legislature through the 20 retained by whom when it comes to the senate and 20 leadership of that legislature; correct? 21 21 I think that's a misstatement because it assembly, and that's the reason I qualified it. 22 There's been various permutations of that. 22 implies -- and the reason it's a misstatement is 23 You may remember in the 1990's that 23 because it implies that you -- that each and every 24 each -- there was a long debate about the 24 member of the legislature would somehow be able to 25 25 caucuses, and the question I recall came up in call upon Reinhart for services, and that would be

14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. 14 record at 4:37 p.m. 15 BY MR. EARLE: 16 Q Some more basic fundamentals. 17 A Certainly. 18 Q Who was the leader of this legal team representing the legislature in the redistricting process? 20 Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers can you know, claim to be the leader. You know, 21 I don't think there was any specific person designated. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so			Page 46			Page 48
3 Senate, by the majority leader is the client, 4 4 not - not each and every member of the senate. 5 That would be my ethical view of it. 6 Q Okay. So let me see if I understand this 7 Correctly. Reinharts client in the redistricting 8 process was the senate by - through the leader of the senate; correct? 9 THE WITNESS: Sure. 10 THE WITNESS: Sure. 11 Q All right. 11 Correct? 9 THE WITNESS: Sure. 12 A recess was taken. 11 Correct? 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record at 4:39 p.m. 14 THE WITNESS: Sure. 14 THE WIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 4:37 p.m. 15 White sealing the record at 4:37 p.m. 16 White sealing the record at 4:37 p.m. 17 A Certainly. 18 Q So we hadd three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 THE WIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the respective chamber. 19 Who was the leader of this legal team representing and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 20 Oso your firm was co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 21 Owner where in the leader of this legal team representing and co-counsel. As a sample of the record at 4:37 p.m. 18 Owner where in the leader of this legal team representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Who was the leader of this legal team representing and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 22 Oso your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhard firm and of co-counsel. As a sample of the record at 4:37 p.m. 19 Who was the leader of this legal team representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Who was the leader of this legal team representing the legislature in the redistricting process? 20 So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhard firm as for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would not ever have considered this accounted. As I would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader of this kept to the speaker or majority leader. 19 A That vernation of the Reinhard tero-counsel in that representation, t	1		incorrect because the the senate or in the	1		that are attached and in the cc lines it shows
A Think that's accurate, yes. 10 Think that's accurate, yes. 11 Think that's accurate, yes. 12 Think that's accurate, yes. 13 Think that's accurate, yes. 14 Think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Beat's client was the same client; correct? 16 Q Some one basic fundamentals. 17 A That seems accurate. 18 Q Who was the leader of this legal team representing the senate of the degislature in the redistricting process? 19 Think that's accurate, yes. 19 Think that's accurate, yes. 10 T	2		I think you used the senate in Wisconsin, state	2		Joe Handrick and it refers to meetings with
That would be my ethical view of it. Q Okay. So let me see if I understand this or correct? Neinharts client in the redistricting process was the senate by through the leader of the senate; correct? A By the leader, yes. 10 A By the leader, yes. 11 Q All right. A I Yes. 12 A Yes. 13 Q And your client was the same client; correct? 14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; correct? 16 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each represented to the counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? A That seems accurate. 20 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm; and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? A That seems accurate. Yes MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick; and the few not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically in the record at 4:37 p.m. Page 47 Page 47 Page 47 Page 48 Page 47 Were you the well, generally there's a senior designated. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so with the fear of a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction is evident. 16 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction is evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHITEN': To make clear, these that is on the team of the terrecented to the speaker or majority	3		senate, by the majority leader is the client,	3		Joe Handrick. I mean, every everything in
that it was Joe Handrick. But — so — MR. EARLE: Let me take a quick break process was the senate by — through the leader of the senate; correct? A By the leader, yes. A Yes. A I right. A I think that's accurate, yes. A I believe that's accurate. A I A I believe that's accurate. A That seems accurate. A O So what direr elaw firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. A So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; and co-counsel with the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention was going forward. A Have considered even Reinhart aco-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to — I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason in that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: O Show me where in Exhibit 220 that	4		not not each and every member of the senate.	4		Exhibit 220 is relative to Joe Handrick. Not to
correctly. Reinhart's client in the redistricting process was the senate by through the leader of the senate; correct? A By the leader, yes. 10 A By the leader, yes. 11 Q All right. 12 A Yes. 13 Q And your client was the same client; correct? 14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; correct? 16 Correct? 17 A I Delieve that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each 20 respective chamber. 21 A That accurate accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? 23 mad co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? 24 Correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: Sure. 16 (a recess was taken.) THE WIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the treor at 4:37 p.m. 16 (a Vactainly. 17 A Catainly. 18 Q Who was the leader of this legal team representing the legislature in the redistricting process? 20 A Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick in that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would he are the reson of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would have when as you describe. But I don't want to — I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason in that retention was going forward. 18 Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior remember of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and a live different people. You know, what the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. 19 A That retention was going forward. 10 GNB, DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these a	5		That would be my ethical view of it.	5		put a fine point on it, but that all indicates
B	6	Q	Okay. So let me see if I understand this	6		that it was Joe Handrick. But so
THE WITNESS: Sure. 10	7	_	correctly. Reinhart's client in the redistricting	7		MR. EARLE: Let me take a quick break
10 A By the leader, yes. 11 Q All right. 12 A Yes. 13 Q And your client was the same client; correct? 14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Beat's client was the same client; correct? 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 correct? 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Beat firm; and co-counsel with the Michael Beat firm; and acco-counsel with the Michael Beat firm; and co-counsel with the Michael Beat firm; and co-counsel with the Michael Beat firm; and co-counsel, You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to late were considered him a co-counsel, nor would that retention was going forward. 13 BY MR. EARLE: 14 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to law that representation was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 BY MR. EARLE: 16 Q Some more basic fundamentals. 17 A Unit with Reinhart firm was different apole. Will, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, we had were you know, we had the legislature in the redistricting process? 24 Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different peop	8		process was the senate by through the leader of	8		here for a second.
11 Q All right. 12 A Yes. 13 Q And your client was the same client; correct? 14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 1 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of evident. 24 explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered wen Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically that the remaining that representation that retention was going forward. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 19 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 10 G Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 21 A Round was the leader of this legal team representing the legislature in the relistricting process? 22 A Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, what was a senior member of a team who calls	9		the senate; correct?	9		THE WITNESS: Sure.
11 Q All right. 12 A Yes. 13 Q And your client was the same client; correct? 14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q Soyour firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, so I would never have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to Law been as you describe. But I don't want to evident. 13 EVMR. EARLE: 14 Who was the leader of this legal team representing the legislature in the redistricting process? 20 Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers cay out know, what sa designated. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so Page 47 1 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 1 wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that representation, though they may technically the properties of the team. 13 The VIDEGGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 4:37 p.m. 14 Certainly. 24 Certainly. 25 Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, know any lawyers cay you know, claim to be the leader. You know, what myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so Page 47 1 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots	10	A	By the leader, yes.	10		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
12	11	Q	All right.	11		the record at 4:29 p.m.
14 A I think that's accurate, yes. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to that representation, though they may technically that representation was going forward. 18 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. 19 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. 19 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. 19 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. 10 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and	12	A	_	12		(A recess was taken.)
14 record at 4:37 p.m. 15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; 16 correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q Sow we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to Li wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. 16 Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers can you know, claim to be the leader. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so Page 47 Page 47 Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 14 Evouldbe a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader of this legal team representing different people. You know, who wan you know, valued in the registration in the redistricting process? Page 47 Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 12 Word in the first problem with regard to a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in the redistriction probably get different opinions from different people. You know, was any specific person designated. You know, we had mysel and Eric McLeod and then were divergent years on the team of the	13	Q	And your client was the same client; correct?	13		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
15 Q And Michael Best's client was the same client; correct? A Delieve that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? 23 A That seems accurate. 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. 26 Page 47 1 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to both and the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would a never have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to law have been as you describe. But I don't want to evident. 28 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. 29 A Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers cay you know, claim to be the leader. You know, the may self and Eric MeLeod and then Ray Taffora, so			•	14		record at 4:37 p.m.
16 Correct? 17 A I believe that's accurate. 18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate 19 and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Accordance 19 and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Accordance 19 and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Accordance 19 and the assembly by the leadership of each 19 Accordance 19 and the eigislature in the redistricting process? A Certainty. A Certainty. A Well, you'd probably get different opinions from different people. You know, how many lawyers ca you know, claim to be the leader. You know, liferent people. You know, what a myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so	15	O	· -	15	BY	_
18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 A That seems accurate. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsed with the Michael Best firm; correct? 23 and co-counsed with the Michael Best firm; correct? 24 Correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would Interpretention, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A RDAUGHITERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are or here. But subject to that, go shead and an answer, Mr. Troupis.			•	16	O	Some more basic fundamentals.
18 Q So we had three law firms representing the senate and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. 20 A That seems accurate. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsed with the Michael Best firm; correct? 23 and co-counsed with the Michael Best firm; correct? 24 Correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would Interpretention, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A RDAUGHITERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are or here. But subject to that, go shead and an answer, Mr. Troupis.		Α	I believe that's accurate.	17	-	
and the assembly by the leadership of each respective chamber. A That seems accurate. 2 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. By MR. EARLE: Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and we have considered him a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are - at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are noted that are noted that are noted that are not there. But subject to that, go ahead and an answer, Mr. Troupis.						-
20 respective chamber. 21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a — slightly 25 different and it has to do with the question of 3 co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I 4 explained earlier, the problem with regard to 3 Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the 6 retention of the Reinhart firm was for services 7 from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would 8 never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would 9 I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in 10 that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to — 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 17 A I don't think there was any specific person designated. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so — McLeod and then Ray		4			•	
21 A That seems accurate. 22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly 2 different and it has to do with the question of 3 co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I 4 explained earlier, the problem with regard to 3 Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the 6 retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would 8 never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in 10 that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because ther are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis.			-		A	
22 Q So your firm was co-counsel with the Reinhart firm and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 23 and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; 24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. 25 McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so Page 47 Page 47 Page 1 Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and explained earlier, the problem with regard to 3 De Handrick, is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would 1 have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel, nor would 10 that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. 16 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 19 Which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 Show me where are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. 20 So that when I say that, even though 12 divergence of views among us. 21 divergence of views among us. 22 divergence of views among us. 23 divergence of views among us. 24 so that when I say that, even though 25 divergence of views among us. 25 divergence of views among us. 26 divergence of views among us. 26 that when I say that, even though 27 divergence of views among us. 27 divergence of views among us. 28 divergence of views among us. 28 divergence of views among us. 29 divergence of views among		A	-			
and co-counsel with the Michael Best firm; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think there was any specific person designated. You know, we had myself and Eric McLeod and then Ray Taffora, so Page 47 Page 47 Page 47 I Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and I twould be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? A The speaker or majority leader. All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views? All right. Did there ever come a time where majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A The speaker or majority leader. A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who cal						
24 correct? 25 MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 47 Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BYMR. EARLE: Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. Meleod and then Ray Taffora, so Meleod and then Ray Taffora, so Meleod and then Ray Taffora, so Page Page Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and I twould be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. O Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? A The speaker or majority leader. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are noted that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis.		4	•			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to- I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. By MR. EARLE: Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. Page Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and Q Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A The speaker or majority leader. A The speaker or majority leader. A The speaker or majority leader. A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for thatI mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though						
Page 47 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the ferention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel in have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason I was the retention was going forward. By MR. EARLE: Joe Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that arnothere. But subject to that, go ahead and an swer, Mr. Troupis. Page 47 Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 2 Mere you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots on the team. A I						
1 THE WITNESS: That's a slightly 2 different and it has to do with the question of 3 co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I 4 explained earlier, the problem with regard to 5 Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the 6 retention of the Reinhart firm was for services 7 from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would 8 never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would 9 I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in 10 that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 1 Q Were you the well, generally there's a senior member of a team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and 1 Exhibit the shots when shots need to be called, and 14 A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. 10 Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? 11 A The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views? 13 I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us.			MR. 110Bin. Objection.			
different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to 5 Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: Youldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. You wildn't say that because Joe was the reason of evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. You which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. You which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. You wouldn't say that distinction is evident. You which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. You wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason of you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together — I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so — and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. You would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. No Way. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? The speaker or majority leader. A The speaker or majority leader. A I dan't green the clarification to Exhibit 220, was and they made a call between the divergent views? A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together — I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so — and Ray. So it was unli			Page 47			Page 49
different and it has to do with the question of co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to-law that retention was going forward. By MR. EARLE: O Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. O MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these because there are enclosures that are noted that and not allowers that are noted that and not allowers and so the team who calls the shots when shots need to be called, and It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don	1		THE WITNESS: That's a slightly	1	O	Were you the well, generally there's a senior
co-counsel. You know, what's a counsel. As I explained earlier, the problem with regard to Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the freention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to- I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason Hay MR. EARLE: So Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. So Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. 3 need to be called, and 4 A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? A The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though					·	, 6
4 explained earlier, the problem with regard to 5 Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the 6 retention of the Reinhart firm was for services 7 from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would 8 never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would 9 I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in 10 that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 4 A It would be a bit arrogant of me to say I was the leader because I don't think there was any such designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. 4 Q Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? 4 The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 5 O that when I say that, even though			-	3		
Joe Handrick is that he's not a lawyer, and so the retention of the Reinhart firm was for services from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically I have been as you describe. But I don't want to law that retention was going forward. I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. I BY MR. EARLE: I Was me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. I A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. I A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. I A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. I Read of the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. I worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick has are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and an answer, Mr. Troupis.					A	,
from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically leader. I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: I Wowlent. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. designation, but I clearly had the most experience on the team. Design the final call? A The speaker or majority leader. A I dright. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader. A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though				5		
from Joe Handrick, not as a lawyer. So I would never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically leader that retention was going forward. I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason I wouldn't say that because Joe was th			5 .	6		-
8 never have considered him a co-counsel, nor would 9 I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in 10 that representation, though they may technically 11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 8 Q Okay. And when there were questions that needed to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? 10 made the final call? 11 A The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader. 13 divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader. 14 I a The speaker or majority leader. 15 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views, who made the final call? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though						- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
I have considered even Reinhart a co-counsel in that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. I don't think it is. That's why I said it. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these manswer, Mr. Troupis. because there are enclosures that are noted that answer, Mr. Troupis. be to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? to be decided and there were divergent views, who made the final call? The speaker or majority leader. All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views, who made the final call? A I the speaker or majority leader. A I can't remember and they made a call between the divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader. A II can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though			•		O	
that representation, though they may technically have been as you describe. But I don't want to I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason that retention was going forward. BY MR. EARLE: Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these may because there are enclosures that are noted that are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that answer, Mr. Troupis. 10 made the final call? MR Daught Enal call? A The speaker or majority leader. 11 A The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though	9			9	·	•
11 have been as you describe. But I don't want to 12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 11 A The speaker or majority leader. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where 13 divergent views were presented to the speaker or 14 majority leader and they made a call between the 15 divergent views? 16 17 reason for that I mean, I can give you the 18 reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had 29 worked together I was with Michael Best & 20 Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had 21 worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So 22 it was unlikely that there would be serious 23 divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though						
12 I wouldn't say that because Joe was the reason 13 that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 12 Q All right. Did there ever come a time where divergent views were presented to the speaker or majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though					A	
that retention was going forward. 14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 13 divergent views were presented to the speaker or 14 majority leader and they made a call between the 15 divergent views? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the 17 reason for that I mean, I can give you the 18 reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had 19 worked together I was with Michael Best & 20 Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had 21 worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though			-			
14 BY MR. EARLE: 15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 14 majority leader and they made a call between the divergent views? 15 divergent views? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though					~	-
15 Q Show me where in Exhibit 220 that distinction evident. 16 evident. 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. 15 divergent views? 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though		BY				
evident. 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the 17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 16 A I can't remember. I can't remember any, and the reason for that I mean, I can give you the reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though						
17 A I don't think it is. That's why I said it. 18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, 19 which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 17 reason for that I mean, I can give you the 18 reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had 29 worked together I was with Michael Best & 20 Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had 21 worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So 22 it was unlikely that there would be serious 23 divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though		Ą			A	_
18 Q Show me where in the clarification to Exhibit 220, which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. 20 MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. 18 reason if you'd like, is that, you know, we had worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick had worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though		Δ				• .
which is Exhibit 219, that distinction is evident. MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these are at least document number 220 is incomplete because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. worked together I was with Michael Best & Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. So that when I say that, even though			•			
MR. DAUGHTERY: To make clear, these 21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 20 Friedrich for almost 25 years and Joe Handrick ha 21 worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though		Ą				
21 are at least document number 220 is incomplete 22 because there are enclosures that are noted that 23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 21 worked before with me and Eric, so and Ray. So it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though						-
because there are enclosures that are noted that are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and answer, Mr. Troupis. 22 it was unlikely that there would be serious divergence of views among us. 24 So that when I say that, even though						
23 are not here. But subject to that, go ahead and 23 divergence of views among us. 24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 24 So that when I say that, even though			-			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24 answer, Mr. Troupis. 24 So that when I say that, even though						-
			-			_
1 AU LITT WITHIAM, WAIL OF THE TO LAW VEIS HEAV DE UNITE CONTENTIONS. THE TEATH V IS						
	40		ind windoo. Wen, on the e-mans			, 510 may 50 quite contentions, the reality is

Page 50 Page 52 1 specific -- what I would characterize as major we've known each other for two decades and I 1 2 2 wouldn't expect contentiousness. decisions that I wasn't consulted on, but --3 3 Q Well, let's take some decisions --O So it's fair to say that you were a party to every 4 major decision that was made by the legal team; is 4 Α Sure, sure. 5 that correct? 5 O -- and figure out who made those decisions. 6 That would not be correct, and there's a lot of 6 Α I told you --7 7 Q How much ownership you want to -good reasons for that. 8 8 Q Such as? Without being arrogant or otherwise or too humble, 9 9 Α I'm a very small office and I had left I'll try to answer your question. 10 Michael Best & Friedrich in the summer of 2010. 10 O You want to find a balance between arrogance and 11 And so the redistricting remained at Michael Best 11 humility? 12 & Friedrich's offices. As you know, they had 12 Somewhere between my Catholic guilt and you know 13 space there. They would have -- they would have 13 what I can and can't say, I'll do my best. 14 had regular access to the people involved on a 14 Q All right. Let's start with the decision to -- to 15 15 locate the redistricting staffing process in the daily basis; I would not. 16 16 It starts with that and it continues law firm of Michael Best. Who made that decision? 17 to the fact that in the fall I had been retained 17 Again, the speaker and majority leader but there 18 by Sandisk as their lead trial counsel on some 18 was a precedent for it because that --19 very significant litigation in the fall of 2011 19 Q Go ahead. 20 20 which proceeded into February of 2010 in the The precedent involved me. That's why I was going 21 Western District. And then I was retained -- then 21 to say that, I was going to add that is that in 22 I participated very publicly in matters related to 22 the year 2000, 2001, 2002, in the prior 23 the senators leaving the state, and so it's a 23 redistricting where we represented, when I was at 24 matter of public record that I was involved in 24 Michael Best, Scott Jensen and Mary Panzer, we had 25 25 located the team in the Michael -- in Michael Best that. Page 53 Page 51 And then immediately on the heels of space. We had rented space to them. 1 1 2 that, I was on my way to Australia early in April 2 So when that came around again, I was 3 3 still at Michael Best in 2010 and I'm sure -- and and got off a plane at the request of Mr. Justice 4 Prosser to represent him as lead counsel for the 4 I'm sure that there were discussions at that time 5 recount, and that recount did not end until 5 that I participated in to have them located again 6 sometime in late May. During that time period 6 there because it was such an efficient way of 7 7 there was a great deal that went on and I simply dealing with this matter. 8 would not have been available. 8 Q So you replicated the Jensen model. 9 Did you make -- in that -- when you were retained 9 Well, we replicated the Michael Best model. Q 10 by Justice Prosser to represent him in the recall, 10 I don't think that that was Scott's decision at 11 did you make the decision to hire Ken Mayer? 11 the time back in 2001. So I wouldn't characterize 12 Α Yes, I did. 12 that. Certainly from Michael Best's perspective 13 13 Q Now, getting back to this question of the team, so where there's so much potential involvement and 14 is it your testimony that the -- the major 14 you need to be across the street from the Capitol, 15 day-to-day decisions in terms of the operation of 15 that's what we did. 16 the team were in the hands of Eric McLeod? 16 Q So in 2012 it was the legislative leadership's No, that would not be my testimony. The -- what 17 Α 17 decision but in 2002 it was Michael Best's 18 you describe as major and not major, I mean, who 18 decision. So Scott Jensen didn't have anything to 19 knows? My testimony I -- I hope was that on a 19 do with it in 2002 but the Fitzgeralds had 20 daily basis there were decisions that would be 20 everything to do with it in 2012. made of all types, and I wasn't around. So I 21 21 MR. HODAN: You mean 2011? 22 might have been copied on them, I might have been 22 MR. EARLE: 2011, yes. 23 told about them, but there are only so many hours 23 THE WITNESS: I don't think that's 24 in the day and I've described to you my schedule 24 what I said, but I was trying to -- I was trying 25 during that time period. I don't recall 25 to be again very careful that you not think that I

1 wasn't involved in decision-making. That's all 2 I was trying to do. I was just trying to, 3 because because I was at Michael Best in 2010 4 when those decisions were discussed, which were 5 then went into effect in 2011. That was what 6 I was trying to communicate. If I didn't do so, I 7 apologize. 8 BY MR. EARLE: 9 Q That's why I got a little confused. 10 A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. 11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and	
because I was at Michael Best in 2010 when those decisions were discussed, which were then went into effect in 2011. That was what I was trying to communicate. If I didn't do so, I apologize. BY MR. EARLE: Q That's why I got a little confused. I Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. A Sure. Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you Senator Panzer make the decision to house the redistricting process at Michael Best & Friedrich and you found it to be an efficient process; is that correct? A Yes, that's accurate. Q And then in 2011 you make the decision the speaker makes the decision to do that again; correct? A Yes. That's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes when they signed the agreements and the like that went right or not right? A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and	
when those decisions were discussed, which were then went into effect in 2011. That was what I was trying to communicate. If I didn't do so, I apologize. BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. That's why I got a little confused. That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. A Sure. A Sure. A Wes, that's accurate. A Yes, that's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and	
then went into effect in 2011. That was what I was trying to communicate. If I didn't do so, I apologize. BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. A Sure. A Sure. A Sure. A Wes, that's accurate. A Yes, that's accurate. BY WARLE: BY WAR	
I was trying to communicate. If I didn't do so, I apologize. BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. I Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. A Sure. I Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? A Yes, that's accurate. A Yes, that's accurate. A Yes, that's accurate. A Yes, that's when in 2011 you make the decision the speaker makes the decision to do that again; correct? A Yes. That's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and	
7 A Yes, that's accurate. 8 BY MR. EARLE: 9 Q That's why I got a little confused. 10 A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. 11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices.	
8 BY MR. EARLE: 9 Q That's why I got a little confused. 10 A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. 11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but you do need to help me understand. 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 8 Q And then in 2011 you make the decision the speaker makes the decision to do that again; correct? 10 correct? 11 A Yes. That's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting to over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices.	
9 Speaker makes the decision to do that again; 10 A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. 11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 speaker makes the decision to do that again; 20 correct? 11 A Yes. That's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements that allowed them to retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and	
10 A I apologize. I wasn't trying to. 11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 10 correct? 11 A Yes. That's when they signed the agreements, a understand. That's the best I can remember, yes understand. That's the best I can remember, yes over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements that allowed them to over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 Q Have you seen documents. I don't know.	
11 Q That's all right. You don't need to apologize but 12 you do need to help me understand. 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the original and seements.	
you do need to help me understand. 12 understand. That's the best I can remember, yes 13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 12 understand. That's the best I can remember, yes 13 Q He signed what agreements? 14 A Well, whatever agreements that allowed them to 15 over at the law offices. I mean, there were 16 retention agreements and the like that went 17 forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 I assume there's some documents. I don't know. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in	
13 A Sure. 14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 18 Public So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 19 He signed what agreements? 10 Vell, whatever agreements that allowed them to over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 I assume there's some documents. I don't know. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices.	e
14 Q All right. So in 2002 or perhaps it was 2001, you 15 and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting 16 process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that 17 right or not right? 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A Well, whatever agreements that allowed them to over at the law offices. I mean, there were 16 retention agreements and the like that went 17 forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 I assume there's some documents. I don't know. 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in	e
and Scott Jensen decided that the redistricting process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 15 over at the law offices. I mean, there were retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. I assume there's some documents. I don't know.	е
process should be housed at Michael Best. Is that right or not right? 16 retention agreements and the like that went forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in the offices.	
right or not right? 17 forward that allowed them to be in the offices. 18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in	
18 A You know, it was probably relatively speaking 19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in	
19 accurate. You know, Scott and Mary both and 19 Q Have you seen documents that allow them to be in	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	- 1
and at the time John McGiver, who was still alive 20 the offices over at Michael Best & Friedrich?	
at Michael Best, who had a very close relationship 21 A Actually I don't. No, I haven't, because I had	
with those folks. So there were a fair number of 22 left there by then. I had left Michael Best by	
people involved in the decision. That's why 23 the time that arrangement for those office space	
24 that's why I questioned, you know, using Mr 24 came into being.	
then Speaker Jensen as sort of whipping boy. He 25 Q Based on your knowledge of how Michael Best	
Page 55 Pag	57
1 was involved in the decision-making and and 1 operates and how you operated in 2001, 2002, you	
2 Q How is he being used as a whipping boy? 2 assume that the normal in the normal course of	
3 A Well, I read the newspapers, so I see how he's 3 business there would have been agreements that	
4 used as a whipping boy. 4 allowed Ottman and Foltz and the and the	
5 Q But how does that relate to the questions I've 5 A Handrick.	
6 asked you? 6 Q And Handrick from Reinhart to be in the	
7 MR. DAUGHTERY: I think it was 7 Michael Best office.	
8 because 8 A To house that, yes, I assume so.	
9 THE WITNESS: Because you referred to 9 Q And who would be a party to those agreements?	
10 it as Jensen's decision. 10 A Well, again, I would speculate it would be the	
MR. DAUGHTERY: The Jensen model, I 11 the law firm and the speaker and majority leader	
think, was I believe the statement which I'd 12 Q I don't want you to speculate.	
13 object to. 13 A You asked me about my experience. That's the	ıly
THE WITNESS: And that's why when you 14 experience I have. I have no independent	- 1
used the term Jensen model or whatever it was, I 15 knowledge, none, zero.	
took umbrage at that because I don't think that's 16 Q I'm asking you based on your experience	- 1
17 a correct characterization. And I am aware, 17 A Okay.	- 1
because I live in the state and despite my 18 Q and knowledge of what the normal course of	
19 personal enormous respect for Scott Jensen, that 19 business is	- 1
20 he has become a whipping boy to the press and 20 A Yes.	- 1
otherwise. So if if I bristled at that, it was 21 Q having gone through it once before	- 1
22 in part because of my enormous respect for the 22 A Yes.	- 1
23 former speaker. 23 Q what do you assume the process would have be	n.
24 BY MR. EARLE: 24 MR. DAUGHTERY: Object. I don't know	- 1
25 Q All right. So in 2001, 2002, McGiver, you, Jensen 25 if there's a foundation, but subject to that, go	

		Page 58			Page 60
1		ahead and answer.	1	O	Okay. There was a decision, would you agree that
2		THE WITNESS: My expectation would be	2		there was a decision to conduct the redistricting
3		that there would be some kind of arrangement that	3		process at Michael Best & Friedrich under a cloak
4		would have some kind of written confirmation about	4		of secrecy?
5		their being located in the Michael Best space.	5	A	No, I would not.
6	BY	MR. EARLE:	6		MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form.
7	Q	And who would have been the signatures to that	7		Object to the characterization of cloak of
8		agreement?	8		secrecy, but subject to that, he's answered
9		MR. DAUGHTERY: Same objection.	9		already.
10		THE WITNESS: I seriously don't have a	10		THE WITNESS: I would not use that
11		clue. Likely a partner of Michael Best &	11		term.
12		Friedrich, I assume.	12	BY	MR. EARLE:
13	BY	MR. EARLE:	13	Q	You would not use that term, and why would you not
14	Q	Who made the decision that each of the of the	14		use that term?
15		three, Foltz, Ottman and Handrick, would be	15	A	Because everyone in Madison, everyone at the
16		provided with stand-alone computers over at	16		legislature knew precisely what was going on
17		Michael Best & Friedrich?	17		because they had to. Those computers and the
18	A	I don't know.	18		like, as I understood it, were either owned by or
19	Q	Do you know whether Foltz, Ottman and Handrick	19		controlled by the state. So there were
20		signed secrecy agreements about the redistricting	20		virtually everybody who needed to know would have
21		process?	21		known about that. So I would certainly not it
22	A	I don't know.	22		was no secret.
23	Q	Did you discuss having Foltz, Ottman and Handrick		Q	It's your understanding that the computers at
24		sign secrecy agreements?	24		Michael Best & Friedrich were owned by the state?
25	A	I don't recall any such agreements, any such	25	A	Well, I understood they were using programs that
		Page 59			Page 61
1		discussions. They could have occurred. I just	1		the state provided.
2		don't recall.	2	Q	Who owned the hardware?
3	Q	Were you involved in the decision to have	3	A	I speculated when I said that. I don't know who
4		individual legislators sign secrecy agreements?	4		owned the exact hardware. Certainly there's a
5	A	I don't think I was, but I if there's an e-mail	5		record of that somewhere. I don't know.
6		or something. I don't remember being participant	6	Q	Mr. Troupis, I understand that this is a complex
7		in that.	7		set of facts and
8	Q	Were you consulted about whether the individual	8	A	You're asking about contractual agreements and
9		legislators should sign secrecy agreements before	9		that's why I
10		any information would be provided to them about	10	Q	And this is a but this is a complex set of
11		the redistricting process?	11		facts and there's a lot of controversy associated
12	A	Not that I recall.	12		with this case. So it's important that we be
13	Q	Who made that decision?	13		precise, because we're going to trial tomorrow.
14	A	I don't know.	14		And so where are you sometimes in conversation
15	Q	So just so I want to relate this back to how	15		speculation can enter and it's good faith
16		the team operated, okay? There were auton	16		speculation, but we need to know when you're
17		independent decisions being strike that. Let	17		speculating and when you're testifying about what
18		me rephrase it. There were independent decisions	18		you know. So I need that distinction clear on the
19		being made about how the how the legislative	19		record.
20		process was going to go forward that you were not	20		Do you know who owned the computers
21		a party to?	21		that Tad Ottman, Adam Foltz and Joe Handrick were
22 23	A	I don't know if I'd go that far. There were	22		working on at the law firm in Michael Best?
23		process issues that certainly on a day-to-day basis would have been resolved without my	23 24	A Q	I do not know that. Do you know who made the decision to have every
25		participation.	25	Ų	legislator sign a secrecy agreement before they
43		participation.	43		registrator sign a secretly agreement before they

		Page 62			Page 64
1		could enter the law firm and obtain any	1		want, to ask them not to be discussing those
2		information about the redistricting process?	2		discussions with other members of the legislature,
3	A	I neither know the predicate to that and I	3		because otherwise you would be herding cats. You
4		certainly don't know that.	4		would have everybody concerned about what's going
5	Q	Well, let's focus on the predicate, okay? It's	5		on in Sheboygan when they live in La Crosse
6		your testimony that you do not know whether or not	6		because that's the nature of the legislature.
7		individual legislators were required to sign	7	Q	So it's your testimony that you had legislators
8		secrecy agreement before they could obtain	8		sign secrecy agreements in 2001 and 2002?
9		information about the redistricting process at	9	A	I don't recall. First of all, I'd call them
10		Michael Best & Friedrich?	10		confidentiality agreements, and second, I don't
11	A	As you've defined the term, no, I don't know that.	11		recall signing documents. I just don't recall
12	Q	And nothing that you did during the redistricting	12		that. You certainly would ask the legislators not
13		process puts you in direct contact with any	13		to discuss it with any other member of the
14		information about that?	14		legislature until such time as the entire plan is
15	A	No. I certainly was in contact with regard to	15		resolved, because otherwise it cannot work. It
16		information about that.	16		simply cannot work.
17	Q	So it's your testimony that this was entirely	17	Q	I'm confused by your testimony but it's easy to
18		Eric McLeod's doing.	18		confuse me, so let's let's try to unconfuse me
19	A	No, that's not my testimony at all.	19		here. You said you were not surprised when you
20	Q	Have you seen the individual secrecy agreements?	20		read about the secrecy agreements.
21	A	Not that I recall.	21	A	The confidentiality agreements. I believe you're
22	Q	Okay. We'll come back to that. We're getting	22		calling them secrecy agreements. I'm curious what
23		copies of the agreements.	23		they're titled, so I'll be interested to see.
24	A	Great. Maybe it will remind me.	24	Q	But you know what I mean when I say secrecy
25	Q	Well, have you read about that in the paper?	25		agreements.
		Page 63			Page 65
1	A	Yes, I've read about that in the paper.	1	A	I've been a trial lawyer a long time. I know what
2	Q	Were you surprised when you read about that in the			you mean by secret versus confidential, but that's
3		paper?	3		okay. Call them what you will. I understand what
4	A	No.	4	_	the agreements are that you're talking about.
5	Q	You weren't surprised?	5	Q	Is there a substantive difference between the
6	A	No.	6	_	words that we're using?
7	Q	Why weren't you surprised?	7	A	Enormous difference between secret and
8	A	Because that's the way the process has gone	8		confidential, yes, an enormous, enormous
9	_	forward in the past.	9		pejorative difference and rhetorical difference.
10	Q	Is it your testimony that you've been involved in	10		One will use the term "secret" to connote
11		other legislative activity where secrecy	11		something improper and one will use the term
12		agreements are signed by legislators?	12		"confidential" to connote something very proper
13	A	First of all, I wouldn't call it a secrecy	13	0	and is common in the workplace.
14		agreement. I would call them confidentiality	14	Q	So when we have a federal statute that deals with
15		agreements and I would say that when one gets to	15		the secret matters, that's pejorative?
16		redistricting, because of the nature of the	16	A	No, not at all. There are trade secret matters,
1 ~		relationship of legislators to each other, it's	17	_	of course.
17				Q	So it's not pejorative in a trade secret context.
18		extraordinarily important not to have legislators	18	-	• •
18 19		concerned about a district that's on the other	19	A	No.
18 19 20		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state.	19 20	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as
18 19 20 21		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state. And so it is the normal process and I	19 20 21	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as to relevance.
18 19 20 21 22		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state. And so it is the normal process and I presume it would be the normal process on both	19 20 21 22	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as to relevance. THE WITNESS: Context. Context.
18 19 20 21 22 23		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state. And so it is the normal process and I presume it would be the normal process on both sides of the aisle, Democrat or Republican, that	19 20 21 22 23	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as to relevance. THE WITNESS: Context. Context. MR. EARLE: I made the mistake of
18 19 20 21 22 23 24		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state. And so it is the normal process and I presume it would be the normal process on both sides of the aisle, Democrat or Republican, that they would attempt to, during the process of	19 20 21 22 23 24	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as to relevance. THE WITNESS: Context. Context. MR. EARLE: I made the mistake of following the witness into this discussion.
18 19 20 21 22 23		concerned about a district that's on the other side of their state. And so it is the normal process and I presume it would be the normal process on both sides of the aisle, Democrat or Republican, that	19 20 21 22 23	-	No. MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the form as to relevance. THE WITNESS: Context. Context. MR. EARLE: I made the mistake of

		Page 66			Page 68
1		know better than that.	1	B	Y MR. EARLE:
2	BV.	MR. EARLE:	2	Q.	
3	Q	I'm dealing with a very experienced litigator	3	Q	redistricting process sign secrecy agreements?
4	Q	here. I recognize that. Okay. But I guess what	4	A	No.
5		I'm confused about is, as I understand your	5	А	MR. HODAN: You're referring to a
6		testimony, you were not surprised about it when	6		confidentiality agreement?
7		you read about it in the newspapers because you	7		MR. EARLE: We've had this ongoing
8		considered it to be a normal thing and then you	8		thing about secrecy and confidentiality.
9		made a reference to the prior	9		MR. HODAN: There is a distinction.
10	A	Yes.	10		So are you going to ask about a confidentiality
11	Q	redistricting in which you were clearly in the	11		agreement?
12	Q	leadership position in that one and when you were	12		MR. EARLE: I think it's a distinction
13		working with Panzer and Jensen, and and you	13		along the lines of disenfranchisement versus
14		don't recall whether you had people sign secrecy	14		underpopulation or delayed voting I think is
15		agreements then?	15		what
16	A	I don't recall that there were or were not	16		MR. HODAN: Perhaps we'll show him a
17	•	confidentiality agreements. I just don't recall.	17		copy of the agreement.
18		But to be clear, don't misinterpret. The reason I	18		MR. DAUGHTERY: Here we go. You've
19		said that is because I expected that	19		got them right now, so we'll know what the actual
20		confidentiality and in 2002. That's why I	20		title is.
21		answered your question so quickly. It's the	21		THE WITNESS: You're not going to use
22		question of whether there's a signed agreement	22		all those, are you? That's okay. It's your
23		that I'm I'm trying to point out. I just don't	23		deposition. It's your deposition.
24		know.	24		MR. EARLE: Well, I just want to show
25	Q	When you found out about those secrecy agreements			them to you.
20	Q	when you round out about those secreey agreements	20		them to you.
		Page 67			Page 69
1		did you discuss them with Eric McLeod?	1		THE WITNESS: That's fine. That's
2	A	No. The confidentiality agreements I told you I	2		what I said, Peter.
3		read about in the newspaper this week. I haven't	3	BY	MR. EARLE:
4		discussed it since then.	4	Q	And I'm showing you what's already been marked as
5	Q	Did you discuss it with anybody?	5		Exhibit 123 as part of the record. Okay? And
6	A	No. You.	6		looking at the agreement, does it refresh your
7	Q	Me. Okay. So this is the first discussion that	7		recollection as to whether you've seen these
8		you've had with anybody since you read about the	8		agreements before?
9		secrecy agreements.	9	A	Let me read it. Give me a moment. Okay. Now I'm
10	A	The first discussions I've had with regard to the	10		sorry. What was the question?
11		confidentiality agreements is with you today,	11	Q	I just wanted to make sure that having now looked
12		that's correct.	12		at the exhibit whether that refreshes your
13	Q	Did you sign a secrecy agreement?	13		recollection as to whether you've ever seen these
14	A	I don't believe so, but as a lawyer I have certain	14		agreements before.
15		obligations, so there would be no need for a	15	A	I don't recall seeing them before.
16		confidentiality agreement.	16	Q	Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 124.
17	Q	That's why we had to get a court order.	17		MR. HODAN: Are we going to read the
18	A	That's correct, to get me to talk.	18		title of the agreement?
19		MR. DAUGHTERY: Pesky Supreme Court	19		MR. EARLE: Do you want to read the
20		rules.	20		title, Patrick?
21		MR. EARLE: And the record should show	21		MR. DAUGHTERY: I'll read it. It is
22		that everybody in the room is chuckling in good	22		entitled confidentiality and nondisclosure related
23		faith.	23		to reapportionment.
24		MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you.	24		MR. EARLE: And above that it says
25			25		privileged attorney-client communication.
l					

		Page 70			Page 72
1		MR. DAUGHTERY: And it does not say	1		decision?
2		secrecy agreement anywhere.	2	Α	I certainly don't recall any but I might have
3		MR. EARLE: You call a rose a red	3		been.
4		flower, it's still a rose.	4	Q	Did you correspond with anybody about whether or
5		THE WITNESS: Are these identical?	5		not to make the decision to hold the meetings in
6		No, they're not quite.	6		secrecy at the law firm of Michael Best &
7		MR. EARLE: And just so the record's	7		Friedrich?
8		clear, I've shown you what's been marked as	8	A	Again, confidential meetings with legislators were
9		Exhibit 124 in this case. Let me switch with you.	9		the normal course. So in that sense yes, I was.
10		This is the stapled version. Which one have you	10		I would have been involved and I wouldn't have
11		got? 123? 124, you've got that?	11		been surprised at all.
12		MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you.	12	Q	Did you have similar meetings, secret meetings
13	BY	MR. EARLE:	13		with individual legislators at the law firm of
14	Q	Now, you're looking at 124; correct?	14		Michael Best & Friedrich in 2001 and 2002?
15	A	Yes.	15	A	I don't recall where the meetings took place, the
16	Q	Okay. I will represent to you that the	16		confidential meetings in 2001, 2002. I suspect
17		Exhibit 124 is in chronological order. The first	17		that they did occur primarily at the law offices
18		one is signed by Andre Jacque on April 26th, 2011	18		in the same way as apparently they did in this
19		and the last one is signed is by someone whose	19		last cycle.
20		signature I have no idea who it is.	20	Q	Did you discuss the issue of how to maintain
21	A	Neither do I.	21		I'll use the word secret but you can use the word
22	Q	May 12 of 2011.	22		confidential. We're talking about the same thing.
23	A	They're not quite in chronological order but the	23		Did you discuss with Scott Fitzgerald and
24		second is one is the 12th, but they contain	24		Jeff Fitzgerald the idea of conducting this
25		between those dates roughly.	25		process in secret?
		Page 71			Page 73
1	Q	Exactly. What was your role on the redistricting	1		MR. DAUGHTERY: Just to clarify, when
2		team between April 26 of 2011 and May 12th of	2		you say this process
3		2011?	3		MR. EARLE: The redistricting process.
4	A	Minimal. I was in the midst of the Prosser	4		MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you.
5		recount.	5		THE WITNESS: I don't recall any
6		MR. HODAN: Let the record reflect	6		specific discussions regarding the confidential
7		that Attorney Maria Lazar just joined us.	7		way in which it would have gone forward. I don't.
8		MS. LAZAR: Good afternoon. Welcome	8		I simply don't recall that.
9		from Madison.	9	BY	MR. EARLE:
10	BY	MR. EARLE:	10	Q	Did you discuss with anybody the question of how
11	Q	Were you involved in the decision to have the	11		to set up the redistricting team?
12		Foltz, Ottman and Handrick team meet with	12	A	You mean the members of the team?
13		individual legislators?	13	Q	Yes.
14	A	I knew that they were doing it.	14	A	Oh, oh, sure.
15	Q	How did you know that?	15	Q	How involved were you in that?
16	A	Because that would be the normal process by which	16	A	Well, I would have been very involved. I mean,
17		this would go forward. They would consult with	17		that that process had occurred during as
18		each member of the legislature to determine	18		early as 2010 before the 2010 elections and, you
19		various things about what they expected and how to	19		know, I'm in and out of the Capitol on a regular
20	0	draw the map. Who made the decision that those meetings would	20 21		basis. So there would have been discussions about
21 22	Q	Who made the decision that those meetings would happen at the Michael Best law firm as opposed to	22		who in the caucus, for example, would be a good person to work with members of the caucus for
23		in the Capitol?	23		redistricting.
24	A	I don't know.	24		And again, I would assume this is
25	Q	Were you involved in any discussions to make that	25		fairly common at the Capitol again on both sides
	٧	you arrow at any aboutono to make that			

		Page 74			Page 76
1		of the aisle, certainly has been for the 30 years	1		Professor Esenberg?
2		I've been involved, that this is a difficult	2	A	Long enough. A while. He's been around a while,
3		process. This is extremely difficult, involves	3		probably ten years or so.
4		as you've pointed out, it's not an easy thing.	4	Q	Is that long enough?
5		And so you need people who are going to work 24/7,	5	A	Oh, yeah. I like Professor Esenberg. He's a good
6		who have an interest in it, who want to	6		guy. Do you know Rick? He's a good guy.
7		participate and are prepared to take the slings	7	Q	When you said long enough, I was wondering, long
8		and arrows of trying to deal with redistricting.	8	Ψ.	enough for what?
9		And so those discussions had been certainly been	9	A	A fair comment. Long enough to know better than
10		going on for a long time, and I'm sure I	10		to try to speculate how long I've known him, I
11		participated in some of them.	11		guess is what I'm trying to say.
12	O	The discussions before the election were the	12	Q	Did you seek to involve him in the redistricting
13		discussions of a minority caucus; correct?	13		process?
14	A	No, they were never in the caucus as far as I	14	A	Yes, yes. In June of June or July of this last
15		recall. They were simply discussions that occur	15		year.
16		between people like me who would ultimately be	16	Q	At the end of the process?
17		involved in redistricting and leadership and	17	Ā	Near the end, yeah, very end. I had been
18		members of the minority parties at the time.	18		that's not correct. That's not correct. I had
19		I mean, we certainly would have had those	19		been asked to teach at Marquette Law School in his
20		discussions.	20		class. He teaches a class on election law and
21	O	Now, I'm talking about the period of time after	21		part of it is on redistricting, and so I had,
22	Ψ.	the Republicans became the majority	22		in fact, taught his class at Marquette Law School
23	A	Okay.	23		on redistricting a year or two before. I don't
24	0	and your contacts with the legislature were	24		remember when, but I'm sure in that context, I'm
25	•	representational in nature as an attorney on	25		sure we talked about it as I talked about it with
		Page 75			Page 77
1		behalf of the legislature by its leadership.	1		his class how redistricting would go forward and
2	A	Yes.	2		the process and the constitutional issues.
3	Q	Okay. Who designed the legal team at that point	3	Q	You made the decision to have him come testify at
4		in time?	4		the hearing on July 13, 2011; correct?
5	A	You I don't think any one person designed the	5	Α	I made somebody made the decision for me to
6		team.			•
7	Q		6		call him to ask if he would testify at the
	-	Who decided who was on the team?	6 7		call him to ask if he would testify at the hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who
8	A	Who decided who was on the team? The speaker and the majority leader.			-
8 9	-		7		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who
9	A	The speaker and the majority leader.	7		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long
9	A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time.	7 8 9		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested
9 10	A Q A	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time?	7 8 9 10		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long
9 10 11	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the	7 8 9 10 11	Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the
9 10 11 12	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority.	7 8 9 10 11 12		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him.
9 10 11 12 13	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13		hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going
9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe Ray would have been involved. So that would have	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m. and it's an e-mail from
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A Q Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe Ray would have been involved. So that would have been the way it transpired.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m. and it's an e-mail from Richard Esenberg, which I doubt it's on the list
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe Ray would have been involved. So that would have been the way it transpired. Who was hired first, you or Eric McLeod?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m. and it's an e-mail from Richard Esenberg, which I doubt it's on the list because it involves a third party.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q Q	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe Ray would have been involved. So that would have been the way it transpired. Who was hired first, you or Eric McLeod? I assume Eric but I don't know that. Because Eric	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m. and it's an e-mail from Richard Esenberg, which I doubt it's on the list because it involves a third party. I wouldn't have thought so. This is the first
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A	The speaker and the majority leader. Would you identify the team at that point in time. Which point in time? When you became when the Republicans became the majority. Oh, I think it was pretty, pretty quickly, probably within days or weeks that Tad, Adam, Joe became identified as people that would be instrumental in the process and that people like me and Eric Ray had not decided yet to leave the attorney general's office, so I don't believe Ray would have been involved. So that would have been the way it transpired. Who was hired first, you or Eric McLeod? I assume Eric but I don't know that. Because Eric hired me.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	hearing. It might have been me. I don't know who made the decision, so to speak. My impression candidly was that it was Ray Taffora who suggested we call Professor Esenberg, but I had a long relationship with the professor, so I would be the one to call him. I'm going to show you an e-mail, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 221. And what's the date on it? Let me just make sure we check. Is this one of the ones that This one, I'm pretty sure it's not on the list but it may be so I'll give you the date. It's July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m. and it's an e-mail from Richard Esenberg, which I doubt it's on the list because it involves a third party. I wouldn't have thought so. This is the first document that we've had here. I wasn't Brandon

1		Page 78			Page 80
2 Well, Fin sure — and he looks very capable of — 3 A He's very good at it. 4 Q I have no doubt. So — but this is an e-mail from 5 Professor Esemberg to you with ce's to Tad Ottman, 6 Adam Foltz, Fire McLod, Ray Taffora and Sarah 7 Troupis. 8 MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates 9 number on that, please? 10 MR. EAKLE: No, there is not. There's 11 a Foltz Bates number but — which is Foltz 001028. 12 But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it 13 will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for 16 identification.) 16 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 21 8-42 a.m.; correct? 22 A That's what it asys. 23 Q I twan from Richard Esemberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 38 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 39 mean by arranged? 40 MR. HODAN: Myat do you mean by that? 41 MR. HODAN: Myat do you mean by that? 42 MR. HODAN: Myat do you mean by that? 43 MR. HODAN: Myat do you mean by that? 44 MR. HODAN: Myat do you mean by that? 55 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 56 Arranged. You had already arranged for Professor Esemberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Ther's a difference 4 MR. HODAN: Ther's a difference 5 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 6 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 1 mean, that's a word in the English language. 1 MR. HODAN: Ther's a difference 1 MR. HODAN: The You rocured what the e-mail sarranging someone testimony. I just wanted to you 1 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? 2 MR. Hold Mr. Myat do you mean by that? 3 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be serve, you know, this is the -the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper	1	so	1		because I asked him or for some other reason.
3 A He's very good at it. 4 Q I have no doubt. So but this is an e-mail from 5 Professor Esemberg to you with ce's to Tad Ottman, 6 Adam Folts, Eric McLeod, Ray Taffora and Sarah 7 Troupis. 8 MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates 9 Support of Ast 43; len't that correct? 10 MR. EARLE: Stabilit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. 11 Support of Ast 43; len't that correct? 12 But well mark it as Earbhilit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. 13 Will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) 16 MR. EARLE: 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 22 21 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 22 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 23 Q Vou had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 24 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 25 MR. FOLAND: Think the witness is the testimony at that point in time; correct? 26 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 27 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 28 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 29 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 21 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 22 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 23 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 24 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 25 MR. FOLAND: I think the witness is the testimony. I just wanted to a make sure we're clear. 26 MR. FOLAND: I think the witness is the testimony at wall the e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 27 Serbitis 222 was marked for identification. 28 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 39 MR. EARLE: I man that point is time; correct? 30 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 31 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 32 MR. FOLAND: What do you mean by that? 33 Mr. HODAN					·
4 Q I have no doubt. So — but this is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you with ce's to Tad Ottman, Adam Polts, Eric McLood, Ray Taffora and Sarah Troupis. 8 MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates number on that, please? 9 mine on that, please? 10 MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's number on that, please? 11 a Foltz Bates number but — which is Foltz 001028. It will be known in this case. 12 But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. 13 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for ideidentication). It will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for ideidentification). It will be known in this case. 16 James MR. EARLE: The was part of a string of e-mails. 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at a say. 18 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 10 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 11 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 12 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's to strainway at that point in time; correct? 11 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? 12 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? 13 marranged. You procured his testimony in support of Act 43; sin't that correct? 14 MR. HODAN: Objection the wood 'arranged for the string of e-mails. 15 MR. EARLE: He had arranged in, many with proper order. The hearing. 16 A Yes This was part of a string of e-mails. 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q And would you read into the record what the e-mail says on July 12, 2011 at 54-2 a.m., the day before the hearing. 21 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 22 Q You had already arranged for professor Esenberg's technique the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 24 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 25 MR. EARLE: Irm and trying to be secret, you know, time. So that's good. Oo through them in proper order. If man, that a word in the fending the professor fe					
Frofessor Esenberg to you with cc's to Tad Ottman, Adam Foltz, Fric McLeod, Ray Taffora and Sarah Tortopis. Graph Roll Roll Roll Roll Roll Roll Roll Rol		• 0			•
Adam Foltz, Eric MeLeod, Ray Taffora and Sarah Troupis. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates mumber on that, please? MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates mumber on that, please? MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's a Foltz Bates number but which is Foltz 001028. But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 122 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was marked for identification.] MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was was willing to testify. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was was willing to testify. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was was willing to testify. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. If WR. EARLE: No. 121 was was willing to testify. MR. HODAN: Diplection to the was willing to testify. MR. HODAN: Objection. MR. EARLE: No. 121 was was willing to testify. Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. You know, the was going to testify. Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. You know, he was going to testify. A That's what it appears to be, yes. You know, he was going to testify. A That's what it appears to be, yes. You know, he was going to testify. A That's what it appears to be, yes. You know, he was going to testify. You know, he was going to testify. You know, he was going to testify. You know, he was going to deal was will in the Engals and wold will was you was					
Troupis. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates number on that, please? MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's a Folk with a special that show it will be known in this case. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates number but — which is Folkz 001028. MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's a Folkz 001028. MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's to testify. MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's to testify. MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's to testify. MR. EARLE: MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) MR. HODAN: Objection. MR. HODAN: Objection. MR. HODAN: What do you about the hearing which was going to cecur the next day on July 12, 2011; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? A Faranged. MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? A Faranged. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranged. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and marrangeng someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure were clear. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and marrangeng someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure were clear. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and series of e-mails and by this time I believe that possible. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and marrangeng someone's testimony. I just wanted to professor Esenberg? MR. FOLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and series of e-mails and by this time I believe that possible. MR. FOLAND: I think the witness is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that possible. MR. FOLAND: I think the witness is a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that possible. MR. FOLAND: There's a difference between arranging for someone to co				0	-
mumber on that, please? MR. DAUGHTERY: Is there a JRT Bates mumber on that, please? MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's a Foltz Bates number but — which is Foltz 001028. But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it it did will be known in this case. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. MR. PODAN: Objection. The Writhses: Well, success, I mean. you know, he was going to testify. BY MR. EARLE: MR. HODAN: Objection and would you read into the record what the e-mail says on July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing, which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? A That's what it appears to be, yes. Page 79 A That's what it appears to be, yes. You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony in support of Act 43; isn't that correct? MR. EARLE: The Writhses: Well, success, I mean. you know, he was going to testify. BY MR. EARLE: A That's what it says. You wrow, he was going to testify. BY MR. EARLE: A That's what it appears to be, yes. You had already arranged on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking it says on July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing. You know, the was going to testify. Page 79 Page 81 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? A Idon't recall. Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? A Idon't recall. You know, this is the - the secret, you know, was dead to this e-mail, do you recall? A Idon't recall. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying					
mumber on that, please? MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for ididentification.) By MR. EARLE: Q Do you recall this e-mail? A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. Q Do you recall this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 22 A That's what it asys. Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 A That's what it appears to be, yes. Q Oyo had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. Page 79 Page 79 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. The thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. Q O'vot had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? MR. HODAN: Objection when the eximal says on July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing, changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. The thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? A That's what it appears to be one and arranged. MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? MR. HODAN: Objection the mean by that? MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranged. MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the qu		-			
10 MR. EARLE: No, there is not. There's 11 a Foltz Bates number but - which is Foltz 001028. 12 But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it 13 will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) 16 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 21 8-42 a.m; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Exenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 24 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 MR. HODAN: Objection. 27 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 28 Would you read into the record what the e-mail says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 26 MR. HADAN: Objection. 27 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 28 Would you read into the record what the e-mail says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 29 Wou had already arranged for Professor Esenbergs. 20 You had already arranged for Professor Esenbergs. 31 testimony? 32 MR. HADAN: Objection. 33 This with the with the extra day on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing. 34 That's what it appears to be, yes. 35 This what it appears to be, yes. 36 MR. HODAN: Objection. 37 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 38 This what it appears to be, yes. 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. 5 Day on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the hearing says on July 12, 2011 at 8-42 a.m., the day before the			9		
11 a Foltz Bates number but — which is Foltz 001028. 12 But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it 13 will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for 16 identification. 17 BY MR. BARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 10 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 11 8-42 a.m; correct? 12 A That's what it says. 20 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 3 testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged. 5 MR. EARLE: 6 MR. HODAN: Objection what do you mean by arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: Objection what do you mean by arranged. 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. PODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 16 MR. PODAN: Bree's a difference		· -	10	A	
But we'll mark it as Exhibit 221 and that's how it will be known in this case. 13 testimony? 14 MR. DAURITERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) 16 identification. 16 identification. 16 17 BY MR. EARLE: 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 18 Q And would you read into the record what the e-mail save with this e-mail? 18 Q And would you read into the record what the e-mail save and this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 20 20 A That's what it says. 21 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know heaving my land the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 22 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 24 Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 27 A I don't recall. 28 A You know, he was going to testify. 29 A That's what it says. 20 A That's what it sapears to be, yes. 21 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 29 A I don't recall. 20 I think you might have. 20 A You know, he was going to to do. 20 Did you respond to this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 20 A I don't recall. 20 A I don't recall. 21 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 21 A I don't recall. 22 A I don't recall. 23 A I don't recall. 24 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, it item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 25 Professor Esenberg is a part of a series of e-mails and by		•			
will be known in this case. 14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) 16 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 20 21 8.42 am; correct? 21 8.42 am; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 27 Q Vou had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 28 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 30 Q Vou had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 40 MR. HODAN: Objection. 41 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 41 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 42 A Idon't recall. 43 Q I think you might have. 44 You know, he was going to testify. 44 Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 45 Page 79 46 MR. HODAN: Objection. 46 Vou know, he was going to testify. 47 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 48 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 49 Q Vou had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 40 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 41 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 42 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 43 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 44 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clea			12	O	·
14 MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you. 15 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 8.42 a.m.; correct? 21 A That's what it says. 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 24 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 27 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 28 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 29 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 30 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 31 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by that? 32 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 31 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 31 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 31 THE WITNESS: Well, success, I mean, you know, the was going to testify. 32 A That's what it appears to a string of e-mails. 34 You know, the was going to testify. 35 MR. EARLE: A manything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 35 Page 79 Page 81 A I don't recall. 36 A J don't recall. 37 I don't recall. 38 O Ho had a pranged? 39 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 40 Find the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 41 You know, this is the - the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 41				·	
15 (Exhibit No. 221 was marked for identification.) 16 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 19 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 20 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 20 21 8:42 a.m.; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 27 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 25 testimony at that point in time; correct? 28 A MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 25 mean by arranged? 29 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 27 arranged. 29 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 29 Arranged. 20 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 21 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 21 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 21 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 21 MR. HODAN: I think the witness is 21 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 29 professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 21 EYM MR. EARLE: MRA point in time; correct? 22 A I don't recall. 23 Q I think you might have. 24 A Tou know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 25 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 26 Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 27 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 28 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 39 Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 30 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 31 Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 32 Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg: correct? 39 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better	14	MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you.	14		, and the second
16 identification.) 17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m; correct? 21 8:42 a.m; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 24 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 26 Page 79 27 Page 81 28 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 29 You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 30 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 31 Sentimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 4 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 5 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 5 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 5 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 6 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 7 Page 79 8 MR. EARLE: MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 6 MR. FEARLE: I had arranged it, MR. EARLE: I hink the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 7 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 8 MR. EARLE: I believe that 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. Tad will give you a call to give you then unabers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.			15		
17 BY MR. EARLE: 18 Q Do you recall this e-mail? 19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 3 says on July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing. 21 8:42 a.m.; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? 24 Page 79 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 3 testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, Iman, that's a word in the English language. 10 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, Iman, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, Iman, that's a word in the English language. 12 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 21 EY MR. EARLE: Carranged. 22 A I don't recall. 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 Correct? 24 Correct? 25 Did you respond to this e-mail to show on you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 24 A I don't recall. 25 July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing. 26 A Hast anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 26 Did you respond to this e-mail, do you respond to this e-mail, do you respond to this e-mail of the wow analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority d	16	•	16		
19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 21 8:42 a.m.; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 3 testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 5 mean by arranged? 6 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m., the day before the hearing. 20 the hearing. 21 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 1 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 2 A I don't recall. 3 Q I think you might have. 4 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or	17	,	17	BY	
19 A Yes. This was part of a string of e-mails. 20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 21 8:42 a.m.; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 3 testimony at that point in time; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 5 mean by arranged? 6 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 8.42 a.m., the day before the hearing. 20 the hearing. 21 A Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 1 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 2 A I don't recall. 3 Q I think you might have. 4 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or b	18	O Do you recall this e-mail?	18	Q	And would you read into the record what the e-mail
20 Q And this e-mail is dated July 12, 2011 at 8:42 a.m; correct? 21 A That's what it says. 22 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? 24 Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 10 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness is 17 version. 18 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 18 the clear. I think the witness is 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 19 testify. 20 BY MR. EARLE: 21 W MR. EARLE: When a given by the Court. Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	19		19		-
21 8:42 a.m; correct? 22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's 3 testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 5 mean by arranged? 6 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg? 21 Eyf MR. EARLE: 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 MHs anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. Page 79 Page 81 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 1 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 2 A I don't recall. 3 Q I think you might have. 4 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 11 identification. 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 14 You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 10 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12,	20	-	20		
22 A That's what it says. 23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the 24 hearing which was going to occur the next day on 25 July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg's and process and whatever else you may need. Jim. 22 how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes, if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority/minority districts. 10 Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 2 A I don't recall. 3 Q I think you might have. 4 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 11 BY MR. EARLE: 12 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 13 A Yes, it is. 14 Yes, it is. 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need	21		21	A	-
23 Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the hearing which was going to occur the next day on July 13, 2011; correct? Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 16 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 20 Which a daready arranged to professor Esenberg and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	22	·	22		·
Page 79 Page 81	23	Q It was from Richard Esenberg to you about the	23		
Page 79 Page 81 A That's what it appears to be, yes. Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. MR. POLAND: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: We would like you to address and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	24		24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Page 79 1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. 16 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 rofessor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 20 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 10 I don't recall. 1 Q Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall? 2 A I don't recall. 3 Q I think you might have. 4 You know, this is the - the secret, you know, tiem. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 14 Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 17 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	25		25		majority/minority districts.
1 A That's what it appears to be, yes. 2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? 5 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 6 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 9 secret, that's for sure. 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 11 identification.) 12 between arranging for someone to come and 12 between arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 13 make sure we're clear. 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 15 A Yes, it is. 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 16 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 refersor Esenberg had agreed that he would 12 testify. 20 He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct?		·			
2 Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you		Page 79			Page 81
testimony at that point in time; correct? 4 MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you 5 mean by arranged? 6 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 3 Q I think you might have. 4 A You know, this is the the secret, you know, item. So that's good. Go through them in proper order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. 9 secret, that's for sure. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:045 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 17 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	1	A That's what it appears to be, yes.	1	Q	Did you respond to this e-mail, do you recall?
MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you mean by arranged? MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. MR. HODAN: There's a difference MR. HOLAN: There's a diffe	2	Q You had already arranged for Professor Esenberg's	2	A	I don't recall.
5 mean by arranged? 6 MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean 7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 10 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 Lexibit No. 222 was marked for 22 BY MR. EARLE: 3 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 4 It mot trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 9 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 9 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you got to do. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 10:045 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 24 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	3	testimony at that point in time; correct?	3	Q	I think you might have.
MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean arranged. MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. MR. HODAN: There's a difference Between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. POLAND: There's a difference MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. EARLE: MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. EARLE: MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. EARLE: MR. POLAND: I think the witness is MR. Poland: We secret, that's for sure. We would you read into the record what you wrote to MR. Poland: We secret. M	4	MR. HODAN: Objection. What do you		A	You know, this is the the secret, you know,
7 arranged. 8 MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? 9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 By MR. EARLE: 22 MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 7 got to do. 8 MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be 9 secret, that's for sure. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for 11 identification.) 12 By MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	5	mean by arranged?	5		item. So that's good. Go through them in proper
MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that? MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, I mean, that's a word in the English language. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. MR. WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would Testing. MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be secret, that's for sure. (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for identification.) BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARLE: We would you to Rick Esenberg; correct? A Yes, it is. We would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10.00 and you will be the second witness between 10.45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	6	MR. EARLE: Arranged. I mean	6		order. I'm not trying to, Peter. You do what you
9 MR. EARLE: He had arranged it, 10 I mean, that's a word in the English language. 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 9 secret, that's for sure. 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for 11 identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	7	arranged.	7		-
I mean, that's a word in the English language. MR. HODAN: There's a difference between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would Testify. BY MR. EARLE: 10 (Exhibit No. 222 was marked for 11 identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	_	MR. HODAN: What do you mean by that?	8		MR. EARLE: I'm not trying to be
11 MR. HODAN: There's a difference 12 between arranging for someone to come and 13 arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to 14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 19 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 15 identification.) 12 BY MR. EARLE: 13 Q Exhibit 222 this is an e-mail dated July 12, 2011, 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 25 A Yes, it is. 26 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.	9	MR. EARLE: He had arranged it,	9		secret, that's for sure.
between arranging for someone to come and arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. MR. EARLE: BY MR. EARL	10		10		(Exhibit No. 222 was marked for
arranging someone's testimony. I just wanted to make sure we're clear. MR. POLAND: I think the witness is the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. MR. EARLE: Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria. We match or better the last map drawn by the Court. Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					,
14 make sure we're clear. 15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 14 9:44 a.m. from you to Rick Esenberg; correct? 15 A Yes, it is. 16 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					
15 MR. POLAND: I think the witness is 16 the clear. I think the witness can answer the 17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 25 A Yes, it is. 26 Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to 17 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.				Q	_ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
the clear. I think the witness can answer the question. THE WITNESS: This is a part of a series of e-mails and by this time I believe that Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. BY MR. EARLE: Q Would you read into the record what you wrote to Rick, Professor Esenberg? Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 correct? 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					-
17 question. 18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 26 Rick, Professor Esenberg? 18 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					·
18 THE WITNESS: This is a part of a 19 series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 28 A Rick, the schedule is for the hearing to start at 19 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.		the clear. I think the witness can answer the		Q	-
series of e-mails and by this time I believe that 20 Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would 21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 29 10:00 and you will be the second witness between 20 10:45 and 11:15. We would like you to address 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.		-			
Professor Esenberg had agreed that he would testify. 21 testify. 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 BY MR. EARLE: 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.				A	·
21 testify. 22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 21 meeting the minority representation criteria. We 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.		•			- I
22 BY MR. EARLE: 23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 24 correct? 22 match or better the last map drawn by the Court. 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					-
23 Q He had agreed because you had asked him to; 23 Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers 24 correct? 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					meeting the minority representation criteria. We
24 correct? 24 and process and whatever else you may need. Jim.					
25 A Well, you would have to ask him if he agreed 25 Q He had already agreed to address the minority					- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
l I	25	A Well, you would have to ask him if he agreed	25	Q	He had already agreed to address the minority

1		Page 82			Page 84
		representation criterion?	1		e-mail.
2	A	I don't know. I just don't know.	2	O	Okay. And in this e-mail, Professor Esenberg
3	Q	But it's clear from this e-mail that he had not	3		tells you to have him call his mobile number
4	·	yet received the numbers and process and what he	4		because he was at WILL. What is that?
5		would need; correct?	5	A	That's the is it Wisconsin Institute for Law
6	A	The reason I said I don't know is because	6		and Liberty. The first name is Wisconsin, I
7		Professor Esenberg is extremely meticulous.	7		believe so. It's the Institute for Law and
8		I co-counsel on any number of free speech cases	8		Liberty. I believe it's Wisconsin is what its
9		and other matters with him, and and he he	9		first and it is an organization that Professor
10		would never have agreed to something in advance of	10		Esenberg now heads here in Milwaukee.
11		knowing enough information to make that decision.	11	Q	What is the nature of that organization?
12		So if if an e-mail from me to Professor	12	A	He would be able to tell you better than me, but
13		Esenberg for Rick is familiar, that is, less	13		it is an organization dedicated to bringing
14		formal than otherwise, that wouldn't surprise me,	14		matters of constitutional import that relate to
15		but I would absolutely not be able to read this	15		liberty primarily. He and I have, as I told you
16		and know if he had made a decision because there	16		before, been very interested in constitutional
17		was other e-mails going back and forth and	17		matters, particularly surrounding free speech,
18		Professor Esenberg is a very careful man.	18		open records, things of that type, and and this
19	Q	But we do know from this objectively that as of	19		was this was really a special organization that
20		9:44 a.m. on July 12, 2011, the day before the	20		he'd been trying to get together and put together
21		hearing, Professor Esenberg had still not gotten	21		over the years and he was able to accomplish that
22		the numbers and process and whatever else he	22		this last year.
23		needed; correct?	23	Q	And this activity that you describe in the context
24	A	No, we do not know that.	24		of this organization is that you and he share an
25	Q	Is there anything on here that would indicate that	25		interest in open government?
		Page 83			Page 85
1		he had received the numbers, the process or			
2			1	A	Yes.
-		anything else he needed?	2	A	Yes. (Exhibit No. 224 was marked for
3	A	anything else he needed? Not on this e-mail, no.		A	
3 4	A Q		2		(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for
		Not on this e-mail, no.	2		(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.)
4		Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had	2 3 4	ву	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE:
4 5		Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because	2 3 4 5	ву	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13,
4 5 6		Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to	2 3 4 5 6	BY :	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011?
4 5 6 7	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY : Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one.
4 5 6 7 8	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY : Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY : Q A Q A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY : Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY : Q A Q A Q A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY : Q A Q A Q A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY : Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY : Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY Q A Q A Q A A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A BY Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A BY Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct? There's two pages to this. Did you mean these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have Rick's e-mail in my phone but I had a prior e-mail
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct? There's two pages to this. Did you mean these appear to be unrelated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have Rick's e-mail in my phone but I had a prior e-mail that had all the addresses in it. So I used a
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct? There's two pages to this. Did you mean these appear to be unrelated. Yes, you're right, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY Q A Q A Q A Q	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have Rick's e-mail in my phone but I had a prior e-mail that had all the addresses in it. So I used a reply to all function. That's what I did here,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct? There's two pages to this. Did you mean these appear to be unrelated. Yes, you're right, and You want me to just give the second page back to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q A Q A Q A Q A A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have Rick's e-mail in my phone but I had a prior e-mail that had all the addresses in it. So I used a reply to all function. That's what I did here, something like that.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	Not on this e-mail, no. And the inference of this e-mail is that he had not at that point in time received it because you're still making the arrangements for him to get it; correct? No, that's not the inference I would draw from this. And I explained earlier why I would not draw such inferences from the e-mail standing alone. (Exhibit No. 223 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Showing you the next e-mail in the chain, which is Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 9:58 a.m. This is an e-mail from Professor Esenberg to you responding to the prior e-mail; correct? There's two pages to this. Did you mean these appear to be unrelated. Yes, you're right, and You want me to just give the second page back to you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY Q A Q A Q A Q A A	(Exhibit No. 224 was marked for identification.) MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail dated July 13, 2011? I chuckle. I remember this one. So this is July 13, 2011 at 10:53 a.m; correct? That's what it appears to be, yes. This is the day of the hearing; right? Yes. And it's from you to Professor Esenberg. It's from you to who is this from? I can tell you why it appears to be. It's from me. It's from me. It's from you to yourself? Well, it was it was a you know when you have that function on your phone, because I didn't have Rick's e-mail in my phone but I had a prior e-mail that had all the addresses in it. So I used a reply to all function. That's what I did here, something like that. Got it. Okay. So this actually so you went

		Page 86			Page 88
1	A	It must have been, yeah. It must have been this	1		but it was a lot of both but it wasn't it
2	Α.	one that you showed me a minute ago. It looks	2		wasn't as much as I said earlier as you might have
3		like it's all the same people.	3		thought, because of my other schedule issues.
4	Q	You and Professor Esenberg had shared an e-mail	4	Q	And I'm trying to get a sense for that.
5	Q	about a WisPolitics report dated July 8, 2010?	5	A	That's what I was trying to give.
6	A	You shared it with me a minute ago, 223, 222.	6	Q	So here we have basically two senior lawyers
7	•	That's the e-mail.	7	Ą	involved; right? You and Eric McLeod?
8	Q	No, I'm talking about the caption.	8	A	Eric's a pretty young guy.
9	A.	No, that's the caption on the last four e-mails	9	Q	But senior in terms of
10		you've shown me.	10	A	Experienced.
11	O	All right. So this is a this is an e-mail	11	Q	Experienced; right?
12	Q	where you're asking him you're informing him	12	A	Yes.
13		that the meeting is now underway and you're	13	Q	And the Michael Best lawyers who were in this
14		inquiring as to where he is.	14	Q	in this redistricting process were subordinate to
15	A	Exactly.	15		Eric McLeod; correct?
16		That's because he's running late?	16	A	I assume so.
17	Q A	<u> </u>	17		So he was the
18	A	Well, I didn't know at the time. You know,	18	Q A	Well, Ray Taffora wouldn't be subsumed is to
19		because I had said the day before that be there between 10:45 and 11:15 and there was no Professor	19	A	• •
20			20	0	anybody, if you know Raymond. Well, I don't.
21		Esenberg in the room. Actually it turned out he had come in and I think I hadn't seen him. He was	21	Q A	Ray was the former deputy assistant attorney
22		on the other side.	22	A	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	0		23		general under Van Hollen, so he was the number two
23	Q	So then you walked over and talked to him?	23		lawyer in the state. So he would he would be
24	A	Yeah, exactly.			considered considerably senior to Eric within
25	Q	Did you notice who was sitting around that	25		Michael Best & Friedrich.
		Page 87			Page 89
1		vicinity at the time?	1	Q	But from the Michael Best & Friedrich framework,
2	A	No. You probably, Peter. Well, were you? Did	2		the lead lawyer on the redistricting case
3		you see me? That's what I figured.	3	A	I think Eric, that's a fair statement, would be
4	Q	I was sitting right behind him.	4		Eric.
5	A	Well, that's right, see? I lost track of him.	5	Q	Right, okay. So basically so the I'm trying
6		MR. EARLE: Can we go off the record?	6		to get a sense is it accurate to say it's
7		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off	7		accurate to say that the legal team for the
8		the record at 5:27 p.m.	8		redistricting effort this time around had you as a
9		(A recess was taken.)	9		senior legal team member and Eric McLeod as a
10		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Videographer this	10		senior legal team member.
11		is the beginning of disk two of the video	11	A	I think that's fair.
12		deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22,	12	Q	Okay. And the rest of the team kind of looked to
13		2012. The time, 5:48 p.m.	13		the both of you as the senior the senior
14	BY	MR. EARLE:	14		leaders; right?
15	Q	Mr. Troupis, just to tie a few loose ends. You	15	A	I won't speculate on their level of respect for
16	·	work closely with Joe Handrick?	16	-	those of us who have lost hair and turned gray
17	A	Yes.	17		over the years, but hope they thought that.
18	Q	And you and him dialogue frequently during the	18	Q	But I'm sure you maintain that; right?
19	4	course of the redistricting process?	19	A	I would think that they would defer to Eric and I,
20	A	No.	20		yes.
21	Q	Not frequently?	21	Q	Okay. And so on complicated, important issues
22	A	No.	22	~	related to the redistricting process, they would
	Q	Okay. Was most of your communication with the	23		seek they would seek guidance from you;
	~	,as most or jour communication with the			
23		legal team by e-mail as opposed to verbal?	24		correct?
	A	legal team by e-mail as opposed to verbal? I don't know if I'd rate them one way or the other	24 25	A	correct? I would assume if they didn't know the answer,

Page 90 Page 92 that they would have come to one of us, or 1 without regard to the citizenship of the Latinos? 1 2 Ray Taffora. 2 MR. HODAN: Objection. Calls for a 3 3 O So during his deposition, Joseph Handrick, at legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: I don't believe I said 4 page 386, line 16 through line 19, asked you the 4 5 following question. So I asked him --5 that 6 You asked him the question. I got that. I was 6 BY MR. EARLE: 7 7 Okay. So in other words, it is important in the okay on that one, Peter. I got that. 8 Q Let me start over again. On February 1, 2012, the 8 redistricting process to consider the eligibility 9 9 of the Latinos who are part of a population within deposition of Joseph Handrick at page 386, line 16 10 through line 19, I asked Mr. Handrick the 10 an area that's being redistricted, correct? 11 following question. 11 MR. HODAN: Objection. Calls for an 12 So you've never discussed with Eric 12 expert legal opinion or expert opinion. 13 13 THE WITNESS: Everything is not so McLeod the importance of making sure that there 14 was a majority of eligible Latino voters in the 14 black and white is as you're trying to make it 15 15 with your question. district. And his answer was that's correct, and 16 that's after an objection to form by Mr. Dan 16 BY MR. EARLE: 17 Kelly. 17 Ο What does that mean? 18 Okay. 18 It means that there are a whole body of -- in the Α 19 Okay? And then the second question I asked after 19 0 social science literature, political science 20 that was: And you never spoke with Jim Troupis 20 literature and in law that's developed around what 21 21 about the importance of determining whether or not are the appropriate criteria to determine, you 22 it was possible to draw a district that had a 22 know, whether a specific district can elect a 23 majority of eligible Latino voters in it, and 23 representative of choice for that minority group. 24 again Mr. Kelly objected to form and again 24 You've chosen to isolate citizenship as one of 25 25 those and you're entitled to do that, but it's Mr. Handrick answered that's right, that's Page 91 Page 93 not, I don't think, generally accepted, at least 1 correct. 1 2 2 Α I don't believe it is, that that would be somehow Okay. 3 Q 3 Okay? Do you dispute that statement? a trumping criteria, particularly in Milwaukee, 4 A I think I answered earlier that I didn't recall 4 particularly in the districts you're involved with 5 having those kinds of conversations if eligible in 5 here where they have consistently elected a 6 this case is citizenship. I don't think that --6 Latino. So it wouldn't be something that would 7 7 my assumption is here when you're using the term have come to mind as a serious question in that 8 "eligible" there you're talking about whether or 8 district or those districts. 9 not they were citizens or the like and there was 9 Q Before you came here today, did you speak with any 10 a -- I think I acknowledged earlier that we didn't 10 lawyer from the Reinhart law firm about having to 11 have any substantial discussions about that. 11 be deposed? 12 Q Okay. So an eligible, meaning an eligible voter, 12 Α I called Patrick Hodan on Friday night after I'd 13 13 that means the voter has to qualify; correct? been served. I think it was Friday night. 14 Well, that's what I interpreted it as. 14 Patrick probably knows better. Friday night or Α 15 Citizenship and voting age are the two salient 15 0 Saturday morning to say I just got a subpoena to 16 criteria; correct? 16 appear at trial. What's this about. And what did Mr. Hodan say to you? 17 Α There are other criteria such as residency or not 17 0 18 being a felon or whatever, but yeah, those are the 18 Α I think he explained that he didn't know what it 19 19 two primary ones. was about. He assumed it was about my contacts 20 20 Q And the two primary ones that are customarily of with MALDEF and was a consequence of the decision 21 relevance to redistricting efforts are citizenship 21 the day before on the attorney privilege issues, 22 and voting age; correct? 22 which had come out apparently on Thursday night. 23 Α I don't believe citizenship is. 23 And I think I then talked to him again on Saturday 24 Q So you think it's appropriate to redistrict 24 morning and I asked him to call you, I believe, to 25 populations that include large numbers of Latinos 25 explain that I had just come off an incredibly

		Page 94			Page 96
1		long and difficult trial and I was supposed to be	1		whether the configuration of the 8th and 9th
2		on vacation. So that's that's what we	2		relative to each other was constrained to the
3		discussed.	3		the third senate district as it had been drawn.
4	Q	Which is why you're enjoying this evening so much.	4		So that in other words, that the team felt that it
5	A	Yes. I hope that tomorrow night I'm at Sandals or	5		was amenable to accommodating concerns or
6		somewhere else, but, you know, I think my marriage	6		interests of the Latino community as long as those
7		is going to need that at this point. So those are	7		could be constrained within the third senate
8		the conversations I had with him.	8		district so as not to affect the boundaries of the
9	Q	And the record should reflect that there is a	9		third senate district. Is that an accurate
10		joking nature, joking about it.	10		statement?
11	A	We're not trying to I appreciate that.	11	A	No. As I told you before, it's time sensitive.
12	Q	Nobody's being mean.	12	Q	You wrote some e-mails about it.
13	A	I appreciate that.	13	A	Right, and exactly what I said, it's time
14	Q	All right. So did you have any substantive	14		sensitive. The the time, it depends upon the
15		discussions with Mr. Hodan or anybody else from	15		time period you're talking about. Containing
16		the Reinhart law firm about the legal issues in	16		as legislation moves forward and gets closer and
17		this case?	17		closer in time, and because of the ripple effect
18	A	No.	18		of any redistricting move, any change in a
19	Q	Did you have any substantive conversations with	19		particular district, some things become locked in
20		anybody at the attorney general's office about the	20		as a practical matter because the ripple effect
21		legal issues in this case?	21		becomes so dramatic, especially when you're on a
22	A	No.	22		time sensitive process, which at some point this
23	Q	Did you have any substantive discussions about the	23		process became, you want to be careful to contain
24		legal issues in this case with anybody other than	24		the changes within particular areas. So that's
25		the lawyers at Whyte Hirschboeck?	25		why I answered the first question it was time
		D 05			
		Page 95			Page 97
1	A	No.	1		Page 97 sensitive. I haven't heard that question and
1 2	A Q		1 2		
		No.		Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and
2		No. What is your understanding of the legal issues	2	Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason.
2 3		No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony	2	Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the
2 3 4	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to?	2 3 4	Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee;
2 3 4 5	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that	2 3 4 5		sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct?
2 3 4 5 6	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF,	2 3 4 5 6		sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and	2 3 4 5 6 7		sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A Q	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the Latino community in effect was those elements of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you? Yes. Okay. You follow it? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the Latino community in effect was those elements of the Latino community with whom you and other members of the team had contact with, those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you? Yes. Okay. You follow it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the Latino community in effect was those elements of the Latino community with whom you and other members of the community, those Latinos were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you? Yes. Okay. You follow it? Yes. Do you disagree with that? It's time sensitive. The so I don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the Latino community in effect was those elements of the Latino community with whom you and other members of the community, those Latinos were invited to consider configurations as long as the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	No. What is your understanding of the legal issues that pertain to your that your testimony pertains to? I told you that all I could figure out was is that because of my third party contacts with MALDEF, that that was a reasonable area of inquiry and that's what I told Patrick. Okay. I'm going to going back to the Joseph Handrick deposition of February 1, 2012 at page 384, line 15 through line 19, I asked the following question: And is and it's accurate to say that the team's strategic position was that there was flexibility as far as drawing the 8th and 9th relative to each other as long as it did not cause a ripple effect outside the third senate district; is that correct? Answer: Yes. That's the question to Joe from you? Yes. Okay. You follow it? Yes. Do you disagree with that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A	sensitive. I haven't heard that question and answer before but that was my reason. You don't disagree with the proposition that the redistricting team started with Milwaukee; correct? Oh, no, that's correct. We started in we started in 2000 as well. So did the Court. That's where you need to start. And so just so I'm clear, putting aside your explanation Okay. I'm sorry if I added more than you wanted. That's we're getting to the truth here. That's what this is about, and I appreciate that. And the truth is what the truth is. So just so that anybody reading this transcript, the finders of fact in this case will understand clearly that as far as long as the configuration of the Latino community in effect was those elements of the Latino community with whom you and other members of the community, those Latinos were

		Page 98			Page 100
1		effect; correct?	1		capacities. And so I want to be extremely careful
2	Α	As I said, that's extraordinarily time sensitive.	2		that I not misspeak. I I had certain contacts
3		That would not have been a restriction early in	3		and I can talk about those contacts. So that's
4		the process, nor was it necessarily a restriction	4		why I was being so hesitant here because I don't
5		later even at the end if something might have been	5		want this record to misread that somehow I was the
6		achieved that would make it better.	6		only source of this.
7	Q	Okay.	7	Q	Okay. So as the co-leader of this team, you did
8	A	In our view. So it I understand why you're	8	Ψ.	not know what contacts other members of the team
9		saying that because because the as you	9		were having with the Latino community; correct?
10		approach the final process product, you	10	A	That's correct. I would not have known all of the
11		everyone is concerned that you not make changes	11		contacts.
12		that are unnecessary in the effect they will have	12	Q	But you do know the Latino community in Milwaukee;
13		elsewhere. So it was but had a good argument	13	•	correct?
14		been made to get beyond those districts, then it	14	A	I know members of the Latino community.
15		would have been made.	15	Q	You know Pedro Colon; right?
16	O	Okay. But just so we're precise about this,	16	A	Right, yes.
17	~	during the time that the Latino community was	17	Q	And did you call Pedro Colon?
18		consulted strike that. Let me rephrase the	18	A	No, I did not.
19		question. At those points in time where Latinos	19	0	And who else do you know in Milwaukee from the
20		were consulted about the redistricting process,	20	Ψ.	Latino community in Milwaukee?
21		your time sensitive concern had already	21		MR. DAUGHTERY: Just to clarify,
22		constrained the configuration of the third senate	22		anybody who's Latino descent who lives in
23		district such that you would accept alterations of	23		Milwaukee that Jim knows you want him to identify?
24		the map as it pertained to the 8th and 9th as long	24		Anybody?
25		as it did not cause a ripple effect that went	25		my body.
		do it did not educe a rippie effect that went	20		
		Page 99			Page 101
1		beyond the third senate district; correct?	1		MR. EARLE: At this point anybody,
2	A	I don't mean to wrestle with the way there's a	2		yes. Let's start with the wide funnel here.
3		lot of pieces to your question.	3		THE WITNESS: Manuel, Manny.
4		MR. DAUGHTERY: Object. I think it is	4	BY	MR. EARLE:
5		compound and.	5	Q	Are you saying Manny, you mean Manny Perez?
6		MR. EARLE: We're trying to devise	6	A	Yes, I've known him over the years. I've known
7		trial testimony.	7		Zeus Rodriguez.
8		THE WITNESS: Anything you can do to	8	Q	Zeus Rodriguez.
9		keep me from having to be here tomorrow, I'll	9	A	And Pedro.
10		appreciate it.	10	Q	Pedro?
11	BY	MR. EARLE:	11	A	And Jose Oliveri.
12	Q	So you're going to work with me on this. Good.	12	Q	Jose. He's a shared friend.
13		So let's give it to you in pieces then. I want	13	A	Jerry Gonzalez.
14		you to consider the time frame when you first had	14	Q	Jerry Gonzalez.
15		contact with a Latino person about	15	A	I'm sure there's others but those are the ones
16	A	I, me.	16		that I've had contact with.
17	Q	Or any other member of the team.	17	Q	So beyond Zeus, Manny Zeus and Manny, did you
18	A	I can't speak for members of the team. That was	18	-	contact any of those people about the remap in
19		why I was hesitant a minute ago is that the	19		Milwaukee?
20		moment, I mean, you know, I have no I've known	20	A	No.
21		Pedro Colon for a long time and I've known a lot	21	Q	Did you think it was important that there be
22		of the Latinos in Milwaukee for a long time, not	22	-	contact with the Latino community in the
23		closely because I'm not from here, and I assume	23		redistricting process?
24		that other members of the team would also know	24	A	I I obviously did think that it was important
					to contact certain people that I thought would
25		members of the Latino community in various	25		to contact certain people that I thought would

1		Page 102		Page 104
1 1		address the question of redistricting in the	1	BY MR. EARLE:
2		Latino community and that's the reason I contacted	2	Q You want to state it affirmatively for me?
3		MALDEF.	3	MR. DAUGHTERY: In your own words?
4	Q	We'll get to MALDEF in a bit. That's going to	4	THE WITNESS: Sure, yes. At the time
5		be	5	I first contacted a Latino group about the
6	A	But beyond that, I had no particular opinion. It	6	about the Milwaukee configuration for 8 and 9 and
7		was not my role in this process, so	7	you said senate District 3 I didn't remember
8	Q	All right. So but this is the this is the	8	the senate number I was unconcerned about
9		question given that you've framed this such that	9	potential ripple effects.
10		time sensitivity is critical. So the question	10	BY MR. EARLE:
11		that was compound that was objected to before.	11	Q Okay. So it's now, you don't dispute that
12		What I want to get to is an understanding of when	12	other members of the redistricting team understood
13		relatively to the redistricting process progress	13	that Latino concerns about the 8th and 9th
14		you made the first contact with the Latinos to get	14	relative to each other, the configuration of those
15		input about the relative configuration of the 8th	15	two districts could be considered as long as there
16		and 9th assembly districts relative to each other.	16	was no ripple effect?
17	A	I don't know. I just don't know.	17	A I'm sorry, I don't understand that question. I
18	Q	Is it's fair to say well, strike that. It	18	tried to follow the question.
19		would be accurate to say that the truth is that by	19	Q And it's probably my fault but let's see if we can
20		the time the first contact was made by any member	20	read it back.
21		of the team, your time-sensitive consideration had	21	(The record was read as follows:
22		come and gone and there was no flexibility in your	22	"So it's now, you don't dispute
23		view relative to a ripple effect; is that true?	23	that other members of the redistricting team
24		MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of	24	understood that Latino concerns about the 8th and
25		foundation.	25	9th relative to each other, the configuration of
		Page 103		Page 105
1		THE WITNESS: That would be completely	1	those two districts could be considered as long as
2		inaccurate.	2	there was no ripple effect?")
3	BY	MR. EARLE:	3	MR. HODAN: I'm not sure I understand
4	Q	Okay. So your testimony is that at some point	4	it.
5		during the time that you contacted a Latino person	5	MR. EARLE: That's fair and I'll try
6		about the redistricting, you were not concerned	6	and redo it.
7		about whether or not a ripple effect would occur?	7	BY MR. EARLE:
8	A	That would be correct, I think, if I understood	8	Q You don't dispute the testimony of some members of
		the question.	9	
9	_			the team that they understood that Latino concerns
9 10	Q	Okay. Okay. Let me make sure that I understood	10	the team that they understood that Latino concerns about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were
	Ų	Okay. Okay. Let me make sure that I understood the question.	10 11	· ·
10	Q A			about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were
10 11		the question.	11	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple
10 11 12	A	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly.	11 12	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect?
10 11 12 13	A	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read	11 12 13	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was.
10 11 12 13 14	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it.	11 12 13 14	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's
10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed.	11 12 13 14 15	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back,	11 12 13 14 15 16	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows:	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows: "So your testimony is that at some	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I specifically said, if I recall my own testimony,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows: "So your testimony is that at some point during the time that you contacted a Latino	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I specifically said, if I recall my own testimony, is that we were we would always have been
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows: "So your testimony is that at some point during the time that you contacted a Latino person about the redistricting, you were not	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I specifically said, if I recall my own testimony, is that we were we would always have been amenable even with ripple effects if we believed
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows: "So your testimony is that at some point during the time that you contacted a Latino person about the redistricting, you were not concerned about whether or not a ripple effect	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I specifically said, if I recall my own testimony, is that we were we would always have been amenable even with ripple effects if we believed that it was important as a legal proposition to
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q	the question. Because I think you asked it correctly. Because you're agreeing with me, so I want it read back to I make sure I understood it. Oh, my goodness, he's finally agreed. MR. DAUGHTERY: Can you read it back, ma'am? (The record was read as follows: "So your testimony is that at some point during the time that you contacted a Latino person about the redistricting, you were not concerned about whether or not a ripple effect would occur?")	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about the configuration of the 8th and 9th were could be considered as long as there was no ripple effect? A I don't know what their testimony was. Q Well, I read you Joe Handrick's A And I said that at some point I wish I wish there was a black-and-white date on which that would have been the case. I don't know that there is, you know, this date, this hour, and I specifically said, if I recall my own testimony, is that we were we would always have been amenable even with ripple effects if we believed that it was important as a legal proposition to make the change that might have been there, but

		Page 106			Page 108
1		comes a point where you simply have to make the	1	Q	You mean early June of 2011. You said 2010.
2		call, and it does not surprise me at all that	2	A	Did I miss the year? 2011. I it's getting
3		Joe Handrick or others would have said and would	3		late, Peter. So thank you for correcting me.
4		have believed that it needed to be contained	4	Q	And you were involved with the decision to hire
5		that the change as we approached committee	5	Ą	Professor Gaddie in particular to assist you in
6		hearings and the like, the change would need not	6		putting together the map; right?
7		to have ripple effects. That does not surprise me	7	A	Yes.
8		at all.	8	Q	And were you involved and you were involved in
9	Q	Do you know when the first time that	9	Q	the decision to hire him to defend that map;
10	Q	Zeus Rodriguez was contacted by a member of the	10		correct?
11		legal team?	11		MR. HODAN: Objection to the
12	A	No, I don't.	12		characterization.
13	Q	Do you understand do you have an understanding			MR. EARLE: What characterization are
14	Q	generally when the first time he was contacted?	14		you
15	A	Sometime in June or July of that year.	15		MR. HODAN: You're suggesting to
16	Q	Were you involved in contacting him?	16		defend, which suggests that he was given an
17	A.	You know, I don't remember. I might have been.	17		assignment to defend rather than asked for his
18	Q	Did you talk to Scott Jensen about Zeus Rodriguez?	18		opinion regarding the matter.
19	Ą A	No.	19		MR. EARLE: Wait. Did you I want
20	Q	Do you know Zeus Rodriguez through Scott Jensen?			to understand, Mr. Hodan, you're saying that
21	Ą A	I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known	21		it's that using the word "defend" the map is
22	A	person.	22		improper when with reference to Professor
23	0	Who is?	23		Gaddie?
24	Q	Zeus.	24		
	A				MR. HODAN: You're suggesting,
25	Q	Do you know at what point in time Manny Perez was	25		counsel, that he was told what position to take,
		Page 107			Page 109
1		contacted by any member of the redistricting team?	1		
2		contacted by any moniber of the real-tribung team.	1		and so why don't you ask him a question.
3	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't	2		and so why don't you ask him a question. MR. EARLE: Were you present at the
-	A				-
4	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't	2		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the
	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody	2		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he
4	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand.	2 3 4		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself?
4 5	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief	2 3 4 5		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you
4 5 6	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break?	2 3 4 5 6		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question?
4 5 6 7	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly.	2 3 4 5 6 7		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted
4 5 6 7 8	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted.
4 5 6 7 8 9	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted
4 5 6 7 8 9	A	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ВУ	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ВУ	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for purposes of the litigation. So that's I would
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the only significant conversations we had would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the only significant conversations we had would have been in early June of 2010 when he was here at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ВУ	MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for purposes of the litigation. So that's I would
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the only significant conversations we had would have been in early June of 2010 when he was here at the meetings. He came to one other occasion he had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY Q	MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for purposes of the litigation. So that's I would just separate those.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the only significant conversations we had would have been in early June of 2010 when he was here at the meetings. He came to one other occasion he had come to town but it was during the middle of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for purposes of the litigation. So that's I would just separate those. MR. EARLE:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY Q A Q	Again, it was during that time period and I don't know whether it was me or whether it was somebody else offhand. MR. EARLE: Okay. Can we take a brief break? THE WITNESS: Certainly. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off record at 6:13 p.m. (A recess was taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record at 6:29 p.m. MR. EARLE: Mr. Troupis, did you speak with Professor Gaddie at any point during the redistricting process? Oh, sure. How often did you speak with Professor Gaddie? Not very often. He had my recollection is, the only significant conversations we had would have been in early June of 2010 when he was here at the meetings. He came to one other occasion he had come to town but it was during the middle of the Prosser recount, and aside from having drinks with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		MR. EARLE: Were you present at the deposition of Professor Gaddie where he characterizes himself? MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask the witness the question? MR. EARLE: I will but you MR. DAUGHTERY: Objection is noted. MR. EARLE: Yes, objection is noted and I'll note for the record and I'll represent to you that Professor Gaddie indicated in his own words that he was retained to defend the matter. THE WITNESS: Interesting choice of words, but if that's what he said, that would be fine. I was I was actually thinking about a different way is that because my representation ended effectively at the end of the legislative process, I don't know his role. I have since learned that his role, that he was retained for purposes of the litigation. So that's I would just separate those. MR. EARLE: And you had no no discussions with anybody on

		D 110			D 110
١,		Page 110	,	DV	Page 112
1	A	That is that is correct except for Professor	1		MR. EARLE:
2	0	Grofman.	2	Q	And they have a different football team than we
3	Q	Okay. All right. So, well, let's constrain then	3		do. So the Latino community that I'm concerned
4		the inquiry to the period before the adoption of	4	_	about, they're all Packers fans.
5		the maps.	5	A	Are you sure of that?
6	A	Yeah.	6	Q	I'm pretty sure. So so you don't dispute that
7	Q	Okay?	7		Professor Gaddie advised the redistricting team of
8	A	Sure.	8		the importance of consulting with Milwaukee's
9	Q	Professor Gaddie testified repeatedly that he	9		Latino community about redistricting; isn't that
10		had he advised the members of the redistricting	10		correct? You don't dispute that.
11		team to consult with the Latino community. Do you	11	A	I don't know that. I think I've just testified to
12		dispute that assertion?	12		what I know. My role is the legal side of things.
13	A	No.	13		I have no reason to dispute that he would have
14	Q	Do you recall being advised of the importance to	14		talked to other people on the team about the
15		consult with the Latino community?	15		importance of contacting the Latino community
16	A	I'm not sure of the characterization because he	16		because of course this is both a legal and a
17		he's the one who sent me to the MALDEF. He and I	17		nonlegal legislative process. So it certainly
18		had discussions early on about the potential to	18		wouldn't surprise me that he said something to get
19		address the redistricting in the Latino community	19		the community, get the community input from
20		and he gave me Nina, is it Nina Perales, I think	20		Milwaukee, which that doesn't surprise me.
21		because he was working in the Illinois	21	Q	And you don't remember any conversations of the
22		redistricting. So that was the context in which	22		team in which this advice from Professor Gaddie
23		he discussed with me the importance of the	23		was discussed.
24		getting community involvement from the Latino	24	A	No, I don't. I mean, he talked I already told
25		community.	25		you what he told us. I mean, in my conversations
1	Q	Page 111 But the Latino community in Milwaukee, he advised			Page 113 with him and the meetings we were in was to get
2		the redistricting team to get to consult with	2		input from the Latino community and that's exactly
3		the Latino community in Milwaukee that was being	3	_	what we did, as he had advised me to do.
4		redistricted. That was the essence of his	4	Q	So you can't give us any testimony about when it
5		testimony.	5		was that Professor Gaddie gave this advice to the
6	A	If you characterize it that way, that's fine.	6		redistricting team.
7	Q	Do you disagree with that testimony?	7	A	Yes, I can. I said that he gave me that advice
8		MR. HODAN: Objection. Lack of	8		I think as early as May when he gave me Nina
9		foundation. If you know.	9		Perales' name and then I started making the
10		THE WITNESS: I your	10	0	contacts.
11		characterization seems reasonable, you know,	11 12	Q	All right. Do you know when was the first time
12		because he encouraged us to get in touch with			that you contacted somebody in the Latino
13		MALDEF and to have them get in touch ultimately	13		community in Milwaukee?
14		with the Latino community here in Milwaukee. So	14 15	A	With a residence in this community? I don't
15		that was my understanding. MR. EARLE:	16		remember. If what you're saying is the residence.
16	$\mathbf{p}\mathbf{v}$	INTELL EXCUSE LEGG.	10		I just don't remember.
16			17	$^{\circ}$	Well all right. You testified at the year.
17	BY Q	Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my	17	Q	Well, all right. You testified at the very
17 18		Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination,	18	Q	beginning of this deposition that you were an
17 18 19		Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation,	18 19		beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you
17 18 19 20		Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation, the with the Latino community in Milwaukee,	18 19 20	Q A	beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you I appreciate your characterization, okay, that's
17 18 19 20 21	Q	Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation, the with the Latino community in Milwaukee, okay? That's what I'm focusing on.	18 19 20 21	A	beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you I appreciate your characterization, okay, that's fine.
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A	Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation, the with the Latino community in Milwaukee, okay? That's what I'm focusing on. Okay.	18 19 20 21 22		beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you I appreciate your characterization, okay, that's fine. And you testified that you taught a class for
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation, the with the Latino community in Milwaukee, okay? That's what I'm focusing on. Okay. The Chicago is in a different state and	18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q	beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you I appreciate your characterization, okay, that's fine. And you testified that you taught a class for Professor Esenberg on redistricting.
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A	Okay. So I'm going to constrain my my examination of you, the scope of this examination, this direct examination, to the consultation, the with the Latino community in Milwaukee, okay? That's what I'm focusing on. Okay.	18 19 20 21 22	A	beginning of this deposition that you were an experienced election law lawyer, that you I appreciate your characterization, okay, that's fine. And you testified that you taught a class for

		Page 114			Page 116
1	A	Like the locusts, you know, what, they come every	1	Q	Well, your recollection is
2		ten, '80, '90, 2000, 2010, yes.	2	A	Is it pretty accurate or not?
3	Q	Well, given all that experience and knowledge and	3	0	Better than mine. I'm not sure I would remember
4		so forth, how important is it to consult with the	4	·	that but
5		Latino community that's being redistricted?	5	A	Well, I listen but maybe I'm incorrect.
6	A	As a legal matter or as a political matter? This	6	0	Well, I'll show you what's been marked as
7		is a very is different question when you take the	7		Exhibit 99, which is was Exhibit yeah, it
8		two, separate the two. From a political	8		was Exhibit 99 to the Handrick deposition, and do
9		standpoint, you know, the legislature, it's always	9		you recognize this e-mail?
10		important to be in touch with communities all over	10	A	Give me a moment.
11		the state and I don't put the Latino community in	11		MR. HODAN: Do you have another copy.
12		any special or different category than the	12		MR. EARLE: Sure.
13		African-American community or the community in	13		THE WITNESS: I apologize, I'm reading
14		Madison or La Crosse or anywhere else. That's	14		it.
15		important.	15		MR. HODAN: Can we go off the record
16		As a legal matter, I'm concerned about	16		for a minute?
17		meeting certain legal criteria, and in that	17		MR. EARLE: Sure.
18		respect to the extent that contact helps in that	18		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
19		regard, it's a good idea.	19		the record at 6:41 p.m.
20	Q	What do you know about the Latino community in	20		(Discussion off the record.)
21		Milwaukee?	21		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
22	A	I would apologize, I don't know a lot about the	22		record at 6:41 p.m.
23		Latino community. I would not put myself as I	23		THE WITNESS: Okay.
24		told you before, I'm not from here, so I I	24	BY	MR. EARLE:
25		certainly know very little about it on a personal	25	Q	Do you recall this?
1		Page 115	1	Δ.	Page 117
1	0	level.	1	A	I do kind of, yes.
2	Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a	2	A Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that
2	-	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive?	2		I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph
2 3 4	A	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes.	2 3 4		I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated
2 3 4 5	A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive?	2 3 4 5	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct?
2 3 4 5 6	A	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an	2 3 4 5 6	Q A	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5	A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in	2 3 4 5	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q A	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Q A Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your testimony or somebody else's that day but it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact that the article made comments about the speed of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A A	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your testimony or somebody else's that day but it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact that the article made comments about the speed of the process. In fact, it was he wishes more time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A A Q Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your testimony or somebody else's that day but it was It was after the hearing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact that the article made comments about the speed of the process. In fact, it was he wishes more time were given to the process and that's Zeus, who I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A A Q Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your testimony or somebody else's that day but it was It was after the hearing? I remember just having discussions after the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact that the article made comments about the speed of the process. In fact, it was he wishes more time were given to the process and that's Zeus, who I told you, you know, Zeus Rodriguez. So that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A A Q Q	level. What do you know have you ever heard of a street called Cesar Chavez Drive? Yes. What do you know about Cesar Chavez Drive? Only what I've learned here, that it's an important street in that part of the world, in that part of the city. Where did you hear that when you said "I've heard that here"? The during the course of the discussions that occurred, actually it was after the hearings and I think maybe you mentioned it at the hearings. I can't remember, but at about that time this idea of this particular street where a lot of businesses are located, because I've not I've not been on the street was an important issue. So that's, as I said, it may well have been your testimony or somebody else's that day but it was It was after the hearing? I remember just having discussions after the hearing about it because, as I said, I had not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A A	I do kind of, yes. Okay. Let's place it in context. The e-mail that you sent to Adam Foltz, Tad Ottman, Joseph Handrick, Eric McLeod and Ray Taffora was dated July 25th, 2011 at 12:36 p.m; correct? Yes. And this was after the hearing; correct? Yes. When was this in relationship to the passage of the act? I don't know. It was prior to the governor signing it, I know that. So we can say that this was after the act was passed before the governor signed it; correct? I believe that's correct. So what do you mean, the process still dominates, and you have the word "process" in quotes? Because the article, I was referring to the fact that the article made comments about the speed of the process. In fact, it was he wishes more time were given to the process and that's Zeus, who I told you, you know, Zeus Rodriguez. So that's what I was referring to.

		Page 118			Page 120
1		for the community to effectively participate in	1		sentence of the of this e-mail?
2		if; correct?	2	A	No, no, that's not what I'm referring to. We just
3	A	I don't know about the latter but I know about the	3		discussed the Cesar, the Chavez Drive question,
4		former, which is that I I understood him to be	4		which as I told you I was unaware of to speak for
5		upset that the process had gone forward too	5		all intents and purposes. And the possibility
6		quickly.	6		that meeting the Latino community's needs or
7	Q	Did you ever discuss that with Zeus?	7		desires, even this late in the process, seemed
8	A	I don't believe I did.	8		like something that might be able to be done given
9	Q	And you say notice the absence of the 50 percent	9		the given Chavez Drive. That was simply my
10		senate district claim.	10		observation, but I had no specific knowledge of it
11	A	Yes.	11		or otherwise. I was observing that it appeared
12	Q	You're reacting to a claim by JoCasta Zamarripa	12		that the concern was not the senate district but
13		that she thought it might be possible to draw a	13		was the way in which 8 and 9 had been divided.
14		senate district that had a 50 percent Latino	14	Q	So I just want to be clear. On June 25th, after
15		population?	15		the passage of the act before the governor had
16	A	I had understood her testimony she was not	16		signed it, you were
17		testifying but she was during the course of the	17		MR. DAUGHTERY: July 25th actually.
18		hearing that took place, I believe on the 13th,	18		MR. EARLE: Thank you. I appreciate
19		JoCasta had repeatedly suggested that there could	19		that. It's getting late. I'm sorry.
20		be a majority senate district. And in the course	20		MR. DAUGHTERY: I understand.
21		of that, I did not understand it to be she	21	BY	MR. EARLE:
22		thought, she said it could be and I believe I	22	Q	On July 25th, 2011 after the act had been passed,
23		thought she said we actually have a map. It	23		Act 43 had been passed into law by the legislature
24		wouldn't have surprised me that she had maps	24		before the governor had signed it into law, you
25		because because the Democrats had access to the	25		were stating here that the alternative of
		Page 119			Page 121
1		same software and it was it was surprising to	1		redrawing within that area remains a possibility,
2		me at the hearing that they did not present maps	2		and you're speaking here in the context of
3		and present alternatives because everybody had the	3		reconfiguring 8 and 9 within the boundaries of
4		same software and the same information now for	4		those two districts; correct?
5		six, eight months.	5	A	That's a fair statement.
6		And so when she said that, I	6	Q	So at this point in time, as a member of the legal
7		immediately I was surprised and I I remember	7		team
8		that I went to our people because I didn't run the	8	A	Yes.
9		maps. So that's why I'm saying that because I was	9	Q	because you were still a member of the legal
10		very surprised that you could draw 50 percent,	10		team; correct?
11		because if we could, then we probably would have	11	A	Yes.
12		tried.	12	Q	It was your view that it was a possible to
13	Q	Now, I must focus, the thing I'm most interested	13		reconfigure 8 and 9 in a way that that
14		in about Exhibit 99 is the last sentence where	14		satisfied concerns of the community that you had
15		you why don't you read the last sentence into	15		been previously unaware of.
16		the record.	16	A	There's a lot of editorial comment there, Peter.
17	A	Thus, the alternative of simply redrawing within	17		Let me be very explicit. At this point in time
18	_	the area remains a real possibility.	18		that comment as it would be today was that if as a
19	Q	Now, within the article, there is the the	19		practical matter one could avoid litigation by a
20		suggestion that that the redistricting dilutes	20		simple change of boundary within 3, so it can be
21		the community by dividing it amongst two	21		confined within that, you know, I'm a trial
22		districts; correct?	22		lawyer. We try to solve problems and that comment
23	A	I think that's a fair reading of what's said	23		was about trying to solve a problem that
24	0	there.	24		apparently some people in the community believed
25	Q	And that's what you're referring to in the last	25		but it was not a comment, it absolutely was not a

		Page 122			Page 124
1		comment on the legality or the legitimacy of the	1	Q	Do you know if Scott Walker ever appointed him to
2		districts that were there.	2	٠	a cabinet post?
3	Q	But it was a comment that recognized the legality	3	A	No, I don't. Did he?
4		of an effort to alter the district so as to	4	Q	Yes, he did.
5		respond to concerns of a community.	5	A	No, I didn't know that.
6	Α	There are an infinite number of ways to draw	6	Q	Okay. Okay. All right. But outside of in
7		districts, infinite in the state, and this was	7	٠	what context do you know him then?
8		your comment is correct, I think, Peter. You	8	A	I said, I'm I don't know how I got to know him.
9		know, at that point in time, as I would today, you	9		I just simply don't know but he's well known.
10		know, it it can be done.	10	Q	Do you socialize?
11	Q	Okay. Let's get to so I understand this.	11	A	No, no, I told you just in passing we've known
12	•	You're saying today it could be done.	12		each other.
13	A	I understand that the discussions that are going	13	Q	I'm trying to figure out which one is the first
14		on. I'm not I'm not oblivious to the	14	٠	one. I'm going to show you what's been marked
15		discussions that were going on based on the Court	15		already as Exhibit 209 but I assume this is not
16		trying to get the legislature to redo some things.	16		on the list. It's July 12, 2011 at 3:32 p.m. Why
17	Q	I want to try and figure out when was the first	17		don't you take a moment and read the
18	٧.	time you had contact with Manny Perez.	18	A	Okay.
19	A	You probably have some e-mails.	19	Q	That 209 is a trial exhibit number and it hasn't
20	Q	I do.	20	~	been introduced at trial yet, so it will be.
21	A	Okay.	21	A	It will be.
22	Q	But we want to get to the the truth of this as	22	Q	So if we mark it here, it will have a different
23	Ψ.	accurately as we can, so I have two e-mails.	23	Ψ.	number. So you remember this e-mail?
24	A	I wish life were so black and white. I'll do the	24	A	Now that I've read it, yes.
25		best.	25	Q	Okay. And this is Tuesday, July 12th, 2011 at
				Ψ.	onay. Tha this is raceauty, outy 12th, 2011 at
		Page 122			Dog 125
		Page 123			Page 125
1	Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him;	1		3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into
2	Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct?	2		3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please?
	A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before.		A	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map.
2 3 4	A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him?	2 3 4	A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence;
2 3	A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before.	2 3 4 5		3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map.
2 3 4 5 6	A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person.	2 3 4 5 6		3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence;
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Q A Q Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	А Q A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	А Q A Q A Q Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	А Q A A Q A A Q A A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	А Q A A Q A Q A Q Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А Q A A Q A A Q A A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А Q A A Q A Q A Q Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q A Q A Q Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A Q A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A Q A A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of people from Milwaukee.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able to know that what you intended to write there was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of people from Milwaukee. Okay. What position has he held?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able to know that what you intended to write there was they would send some.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A Q A A Q A	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of people from Milwaukee. Okay. What position has he held? I don't know. I don't know. I just know of him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able to know that what you intended to write there was they would send some. I assume that's what I intended to write because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of people from Milwaukee. Okay. What position has he held?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able to know that what you intended to write there was they would send some. I assume that's what I intended to write because that makes sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	But let's talk about Manny Perez. You know him; correct? I've known him, yes. I've said that before. How do you know him? I don't know how I know him. He's a well-known person. In what circle is he a well-known person? Well, among the people I mentioned to you, I suppose. He's a community leader. He was well known. In what community is he a leader? The state of Wisconsin. In the Wisconsin state community he's a leader? He's extremely, he's well known, yes. And how is it that he's well known? Well, if what you're fishing for is because he's a Latino, I don't know. I'm not fishing. I'm trying to figure out why it is that you think he's a well-known person. Because I've known him and I don't know a lot of people from Milwaukee. Okay. What position has he held? I don't know. I don't know. I just know of him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	3:32 p.m., okay? Will you read the e-mail into the record, please? MALDEF is going to publicly endorse the 60-54 map. And you put an exclamation after that sentence; right? Yes, yes. Continue. The will send, there's a grammatical error there, not surprising given my typing skills. The will send someone to testify, paren Alonzo Rivas, end paren. He is testifying in St. Charles, Illinois that's IL in this case at 9, so he may not get here until over the noon hour. We will Before you go on to the next sentence, you meant to say they; right? What, did I misread it? You read it accurately as it's written. They. I think that's right. I think it's they. So is the judges reading this exhibit will be able to know that what you intended to write there was they would send some. I assume that's what I intended to write because

		Page 126			Page 128
1	A	No. My wife is a great one for letters but I'm	1	O	I'm just trying to interpret them as reasonably as
2		not, so it certainly looks like "they" would be	2	Ψ.	I can and I'm trying to get to the truth of this
3		the right word.	3		matter.
4	Q	I think we share the same typing skills.	4	A	You're trying to take certain inferences from that
5	A	Thank you. Please don't hold me too responsible	5		and that's fine.
6	**	on this.	6		MR. HODAN: Why don't you ask him a
7	Q	Next sentence?	7		question?
8	Ā	We will certainly want him to testify as this will	8	BY	MR. EARLE:
9		take the largest legal fund for the Latino	9	0	So you wanted Alonzo Rivas to testify; correct?
10		community off the table in any later court battle.	10	A	Yes.
11		In the meantime, I am hooking them up with	11	Q	That proposition is a fact?
12		Manny Perez to see if they can coordinate	12	A	Yes.
13		testimony all in favor of the 60-54 option.	13	Q	And that covers the
14		Period, Jim.	14	A	I wanted somebody from MALDEF to testify, whether
15	O	Let's talk about the content of this. So you were	15	A	it was Alonzo. I did not meet him until yesterday
16	Q	thinking ahead to the benefit of having Alonzo	16		in court. That's the first time I met him.
			17	0	
17 18		Rivas testify because by doing so it was your view that that would make unavailable to the Latino	18	Q A	But you used the word "him" in that sentence. That's what I said. I was told he was going to do
19		community in Milwaukee the largest legal fund for	19	А	here, but the way you had said it suggested that
20		later courtroom challenges to the redistricting	20		it mattered to me who was and it didn't. I was
21			21		
21	A	plan. That's accurate; right?	22		more concerned about MALDEF taking a public
23	A	Well, if you read the e-mail	23	Q	position.
		MR. HODAN: Objection only to the	24	Q	So the first part of that sentence says we will
24 25		extent that I believe there was already a pending	25		certainly want him to testify. Those words, just those words alone.
25		lawsuit. So I think you said later challenges but	23		mose words alone.
		Page 127			Page 129
1		I believe there was already a challenge at that	1	A	That's what it says.
2		time.	2	Q	So you wanted somebody from MALDEF to testify but
3		MR. EARLE: There was not a challenge	3		you used the word "him," referring to Alonzo Rivas
4		by any Latino community.	4		because he had been identified to you.
5		MR. HODAN: That's fine. Just so the	5	A	Yes.
6		record's clear. There had already been a pending	6	Q	And you had never met him before?
7		lawsuit.	7	A	No, not till yesterday.
8		THE WITNESS: My comment in here is	8	Q	And then you have the second half of that
9		what it is.	9		sentence, and you say as this will. Okay. That
10	BY	MR. EARLE:	10		means there is a purpose for wanting him to
11	Q	So but I just want to make the record very clear.	11		testify; correct?
12		I mean, you're going to stand by this comment, and	12	A	One of the purposes, yes.
13		the comment means that it was your intent that by	13	Q	And one of those purposes was that it would take
14		facilitating this testimony, one of the benefits	14		the largest legal fund for the legal community off
15		of facilitating the testimony of Alonzo Rivas, you	15		the table in a later court battle; right?
16		would be making unavailable to the Latino	16	A	That was one of the reasons, yes.
17		community access to a potential funding source is	17	Q	Okay. You did not want MALDEF's funding to be
18		for a legal challenge to the redistricting plan.	18	-	available to the Latino community for a possible
19	A	Now you're assuming a lot of things and that would	19		legal challenge; correct?
20		not be correct.	20	A	You'll forgive me but I did know that I look at
21	Q	Okay. So you deny okay. Well, let's break it	21		it today and it says will take the largest legal
22	-	down here. I mean, it's, these were your words,	22		fund. I don't think it ever occurred to me about
23		you selected these words; correct?	23		money the way you're suggesting it. MALDEF has an
24	A	Yeah, these words. Not the ones you just said but	24		extraordinary national reputation and they are a
25		these words I did say.	25		legal fund, but you're suggesting that it had to
L		-			

		Page 130			Page 132
1		do with money and that is simply not connect.	1	A	You guys are ready.
2		I would not have thought of it that way at that	2	Q	Huh?
3		time.	3	A	You guys are ready for trial on all these
4		And I realize when you read those	4		exhibits.
5		words now they are the largest legal fund but it	5	Q	We were ready on Tuesday.
6		had my interest there did not have to do with	6	A	That's when I wanted to be on vacation.
7		money but certainly had to do with MALDEF taking a	7		MR. DAUGHTERY: Could I get a copy,
8		public position given their prestige that this	8		please.
9		matter had been resolved correctly and properly.	9		MR. EARLE: Sorry.
10	Q	All right. Well, let's go to the second	10		THE WITNESS: Oh this is a bit later,
11		paragraph, okay? In the meantime and I'll read it	11		okay.
12		into the record to make it why don't you go	12	BY	MR. EARLE:
13		ahead.	13	Q	Well, to be precise, this is exactly
14	A	Whatever. I think I already had. The last	14	A	These are all listed. Would you check these,
15		paragraph?	15		please? Just to make sure that and they're
16	Q	Yeah.	16		actually marked 1 through 9, so if you look at my
17	A	In the meantime I am hooking them up with	17		documents there, you can just look at that. You
18		Manny Perez to see if they can coordinate	18		can look at your list. See if 1 through 9 are
19		testimony all in favor of the 60-54 option.	19		okay.
20	Q	Okay. So this is the first is this the first	20		MR. DAUGHTERY: Yeah, the handwritten
21		time that to your recollection that you dealt with	21		1 through 9.
22		Manny Perez in terms of the redistricting plan?	22		THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	A	I believe so and, in fact, the I probably	23		MR. DAUGHTERY: They're fine.
24		looked a little quizzical when I read that a	24		MR. EARLE: Okay.
25		minute ago because I thought Ray Taffora had been	25		
		Page 131			Page 133
1		involved in making that contact and I may be	1	BY	MR. EARLE:
2		incorrect but Ray must have given me the number	2	Q	So let's go to the
3		for Manny because I don't believe I would have had	3	A	Is this running backward sequence?
4		his number without Ray.	4	Q	Well, there's a sequence here having to deal with
5	Q	And you considered it was important to get Manny	5		JoCasta Zamarripa, and I wasn't going to ask you
6		to speak in favor of the map because in your view	6		about that unless you want to talk about JoCasta
7		he was a leader of the Latino community?	7		Zamarripa?
8	A	Among the reasons he is a leader and that is	8	A	We talked about her earlier. And so I whichever
9		certainly reasonable, yes.	9		one you would like. Tell me which one you want.
10	Q	And this comment was made on July 12, 2011 at 3:30		Q	Well, I'm interested in the Manny Perez contact.
11		in the afternoon, the day before the hearing;	11		MR. DAUGHTERY: Which number?
12	_	correct?	12		MR. EARLE:
13	A	Yes.	13	Q	Number one and which was exactly according to my
14	Q	Okay. And the fact of the matter is that	14		calculation here
15		Manny Perez didn't even have a copy of the map at	15	A	Thirteen minutes.
16		that point; isn't that true?	16	Q	Thirteen minutes after your prior e-mail.
17	A	I don't know that.	17	A	Yeah.
18	Q	You didn't provide him with a copy of the map, isn't that true?	18	Q	So now you so in those 13 minutes you had
19 20	A		19 20		confirmed with Manny Perez that he was willing to come testify for the map?
21	A	I don't know what I provided him. The maps were published, so at this point presumably he had them	21	A	I don't know. I could have talked to him before
22		but I don't know.	22		that. It just says I'm hooking them up with
23	Q	Okay. Let's go to the second e-mail involving	23		Manny Perez, which means I was presumably giving
24	Ą	Manny Perez. It's already marked as trial	24		MALDEF it would probably be Elisa Alfonso the
25		Exhibit 206.	25		phone number for Manny. So that's what this
I -					,

2 I'm hooking them up with Manny. 3 Q Let's look at the e-mail and see what we can 4 derive from that. Why don't you read it into the 5 record. 6 A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know 7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 2 dealt with the legal with. 4 Q Well, Mr 5 A And that was not looks like what it something the core	vas not real and effective and al issues that had to be dealt
2 I'm hooking them up with Manny. 3 Q Let's look at the e-mail and see what we can 4 derive from that. Why don't you read it into the 5 record. 6 A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know 7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 2 dealt with the legal with. 4 Q Well, Mr 5 A And that was not looks like what it something the core	
3 Q Let's look at the e-mail and see what we can 4 derive from that. Why don't you read it into the 5 record. 6 A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know 7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 3 with. 4 Q Well, Mr 5 A And that was not 6 looks like what it: 7 something the core	
derive from that. Why don't you read it into the record. A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know that Manny Perez and others from the Latino Well, Mr A And that was not looks like what it is something the core	
5 record. 5 A And that was not 6 A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know 7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 7 something the core	
6 A Sure. Tad and Adam, you can let the chair know 6 looks like what it 7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 7 something the cor	my purpose. That's the way it
7 that Manny Perez and others from the Latino 7 something the cor	is, an effective negotiation of
8 community will be there to testify for a 60-54 8 that appearance	mmunity wants. I would not call
The sometimes will be there to today for a co-o- o that appearance.	I would call that exactly what I
9 map. You will need to have a large map showing 9 said, effective neg	gotiation to lead to a result
10 that district. You should prepare that and bring 10 that was legal and	effective for the community and
11 it with. You should still I think talk about the 11 the state.	
12 three alternatives. That way it looks like what 12 Q And that's predica	ated on Manny Perez' support when
13 it is and and again I misspelled. I think it's 13 starting the day be	efore the hearing, the afternoon
14 an, an effective negotiation of something the 14 before the hearing.	
15 community wants. Congratulations. Manny is 15 A Now you're assum	ning all kinds of things that
talking right now to MALDEF to coordinate their 16 aren't that aren't	't correct.
17 testimony. Jim. 17 Q Can you identify a	any document anywhere that would
18 Q Okay. So from the last sentence, we can tell that 18 indicate you had a	prior contact with Manny Perez
19 your communication with Manny occurred in those 13 19 or anybody on the	legal team had a prior contact
20 minutes; correct? 20 with Manny Perez	about the redistricting process?
21 A I 21 A I don't know what	t's been produced in this case, so
22 Q Because in the first sentence you were going to 22 I don't know. I do	on't have any recollection of
you were going to hook them up and in the second 23 other documents.	
24 sentence Manny is now doing it? 24 Q Now, you were mo	onitoring the press as it pertained
25 A You read an awful lot into the words. You know, 25 to the activity of the	ne Latino community in
Page 135	Page 137
1 and I might have. I don't recall, but it looks to 1 Milwaukee regarding	ng redistricting; correct?
2 me like I gave Manny's number to MALDEF, and so my 2 A That would not be	e correct. I was not monitoring
3 last comment about Manny is talking to MALDEF to 3 the press.	
4 coordinate their testimony could candidly just be 4 Q Who was?	
5 an acknowledgment that I had given them their 5 A I don't know that	anybody was. From time to time
6 number and they were going to talk. It may have 6 I would get articles	s but I don't think anybody
7 been that I talked to Manny. I just don't 7 I know of no effort	t to monitor the community's
8 remember. I don't know why that would be 8 press or the press	in Milwaukee.
9 important one way or the other, but I just don't 9 Q Isn't it true that ye	ou whenever the Latino
10 know who talked to whom first. I assumed MALDEF 10 community of Milw	vaukee appeared in the newspaper
	o the redistricting process in
	ou would clip the article and
13 who will be there to testify? 13 distribute it to the	
	nce of that prior to the hearing
	thers, I just don't recall
16 who would be there to testify? 16 them.	
	ne of those instances; right?
	le that you distributed to the
19 coordinating the appearance of the Latino 19 rest of the team; co	
-	s after the hearing.
	in, after the hearing?
	d before the hearing.
	e hearing as well, didn't you?
	ou I knew of I recall an
25 A Because you used the term appearance to suggest 25 article, I believe it	was about something you had

		Page 138			Page 140
1		been working on, that came to me sometime in June,	1	A	Again, you're reading into it as if I would have
2		as I recall, but that's about all that I recall.	2		noticed that. I do now and then I see there was a
3	Q	Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 96 from	3		group and I had no knowledge of this group before
4		the Handrick deposition. I'm pretty sure it was	4		this and I didn't take away that who they were or
5		not on the list because it was a Handrick	5		what they were after this. I simply knew there
6		deposition.	6		was a group in Milwaukee that had filed a
7	A	So it must have already gotten there. That's	7		statement on the aldermanic districts. That's all
8		good. Can you give me a moment to look at this?	8		I knew.
9	Q	Sure.	9	Q	Well, the attached press release from Voces de la
10	A	Okay, now I do remember.	10		Frontera describes the organization in substantial
11	Q	The article appears on the back page.	11		detail, doesn't it?
12	A	That's because you guys no, you're not yes,	12	A	Well, it does but I probably skipped that
13		you are environmentally conscious. It's	13		paragraph because it wasn't what I would have been
14		two-sided. Very good.	14		interested in. I would have been interested in
15	Q	Have you had an opportunity review it?	15		the numbers and the configurations of districts.
16	A	No, I'm still looking at it. Okay.	16		So I'm telling you I simply I wouldn't have
17	Q	And I have to apologize, I mischaracterized when I	17		it wouldn't have made any impression. And I don't
18		said you and it's, in fact perhaps it's a	18		mean that meanly. I just mean that it wouldn't
19		function of my age or the hour of the day. This	19		have made any impression.
20		was clipped by Adam Foltz and sent to you?	20	Q	So you responded to this e-mail like 40 minutes
21	A	Yes.	21		the next day in the morning; correct?
22	Q	And other members of the team?	22	A	Yes.
23	A	That's my recollection.	23	Q	And now why did you take this particular e-mail
24	Q	So just to be accurate, on June 6, 2011, at	24		response and caption it in large bold type
25		8:00 p.m., Adam Foltz sent an e-mail to Keith	25		attorney-client privileged, litigation
1		Page 139	1		Page 141
2		Gaddie, you and Eric McLeod with copies to Tad Ottman and Joseph Handrick; correct?	2	A	preparation? Why did I do that?
3	A	Yes.	3	Q	Yeah.
4	Q	And the caption of the article was The Hispanic	4	A	Because the issue of percentages was a legal
5	Q	Community Speaks in Milwaukee; correct?	5	**	question that needed to be addressed in the
6	A	That's the caption of the article.	6		context of minority districts. And so I would
7	Q	And it was a press release from Voces de la	7		have viewed this and I would view it today as the
8	Ψ.	Frontera?	8		classic attorney-client privilege, certainly
9	A	Right. Yes.	9		attorney work product privileged. So I view it
10	Q	So from this we know that you had been	10		then and I view it now as that way.
11	·	receiving you had received information at least	11	Q	So on June 7 of 2011, more than a month before the
12		once	12	·	public hearing, you were preparing for litigation
13	A	Yes.	13		relative to the Latino community?
14	Q	prior to the adoption of the map and relatively	14	A	We were preparing for litigation, period,
15		early in the process, this is June 7 of 2011;	15		throughout the process. That's why I was retained
16		correct?	16		in large measure was to make sure that our maps
17	A	I'm not sure it was early in the process, but it's	17		could survive the inevitable litigation that comes
18		consistent with my testimony a minute ago that I	18		in this day and age.
19		recall receiving at least one clipping related to	19	Q	But you focused the litigation preparation
20		the Milwaukee Latino community.	20		component of this e-mail on the Latino community;
21	Q	And as a result of this, you certainly understood	21		isn't that correct?
22		that there was a group called Voces de la	22	A	That's what this e-mail's about, yes.
23		Frontera; right?	23	Q	So this is why you wanted to take MALDEF off the
24	A	I didn't know.	24		table?
25	Q	What	25	A	No. I was in touch with MALDEF at this point.
23					

		Page 142			Page 144
1		I'd already been in touch with them.	1		55 percent in the second district and thus would
2	Q	All right. Okay. So why don't you read into the	2		lose the benefit of to the Latino community of
3	·	record what the body of the e-mail says.	3		having two districts. So I wouldn't have needed a
4	A	The top one?	4		map for that. I mean, a printed map.
5	Q	Yeah.	5	Q	No one on the redistricting team ever contacted
6	A	Just the top one. The problem here is that the	6		Voces de la Frontera, isn't that true, before
7		group wants another misspelling, want	7		the
8		70 percent. This is classic overkill. I am	8	A	I don't know.
9		already very worried about the 65 percent and now	9	Q	Well, you're not aware of any information that
10		we have groups wanting 70 percent. Can we see	10		would indicate that anybody from the redistricting
11		what that would like look. I assume it makes the	11		team ever contacted Voces de la Frontera; right?
12		second assembly district not much better than 50	12	A	I'm not aware of any, no.
13		to 55 percent. Jim.	13	Q	And you never did.
14	Q	So when I read this, I concluded that you had	14	A	I never personally did. The first time I met was
15	Č	actually taken a look at a 70 percent district as	15		you at the hearing on the 13th of July when I saw
16		a result of your directive to the other members of	16		you testify.
17		the team.	17	O	Okay. And nobody from the redistricting team ever
18	A	Well, I'm asking them, at this point in time I'm	18		contacted the Latino well, let me strike. Let
19		asking them to what would it look like. So I	19		me ask a couple of foundation questions first.
20		hadn't looked at a 70 percent district at this	20		You knew that Latino organizations in Milwaukee
21		point.	21		had formed a Latino Redistricting Committee;
22	Q	But we established earlier that you were one of	22		correct?
23	·	two senior members of this team; correct?	23	A	I can't say that I knew that with certainty but
24	A	Yeah.	24		having looked at this e-mail, I must have known it
25		MR. DAUGHTERY: Object as to misstates	25		at the time.
		Page 143			Page 145
1		his prior testimony, but subject to that go ahead	1	Q	Well, you knew that there was you knew
2		and answer.	2	A	This e-mail meaning the one you just showed me.
3		THE WITNESS: I'm an old guy that was	3		I just wanted to make clear I just was pointing to
4		on the team, yeah.	4		it and it was 96.
5	BY	MR. EARLE:	5	Q	Got you. Putting 96 aside
6	Q	Okay. So when you make a directive to the team,	6	A	Yes.
7		you want to see what this looks like. I mean, I'm	7	Q	Okay. During the aldermanic redistricting for the
8		assuming that actually happened; right? I mean,	8		city of Milwaukee, you were aware that the Latino
9		that happened?	9		community of Milwaukee had formed a group called
10	A	I hope it happened.	10		the Latino Redistricting Committee; correct?
11	Q	So you took a look at a 70 percent district.	11	A	The only knowledge I had would have been from
12	A	Subsequent to this e-mail. I assume I did.	12		that I can remember is from Exhibit 96. That
13		I don't know that. I asked them to tell me what	13		would have been the sum of my knowledge at the
14		it would look like.	14		time.
15	Q	Well, what happened to the maps that demonstrated	15	Q	You would have been aware of all articles that
16	·	the 70 percent district?	16		appeared in the Milwaukee Journal or the Wheeler
17	A	I don't know.	17		Report or WisPolitics about advocacy on behalf of
18	Q	Did they get destroyed?	18		the Latino community with regards to redistricting
19	A.	I don't know that there was a map. You've made an	19		at the municipal level; correct?
20		assumption about that. I asked for a map. I	20	A	No, no, I wouldn't. I would not.
21		asked for somebody, can you see what that would	21	Q	So it's your testimony you never heard of the
22		look like.	22	4	Latino Redistricting Committee then?
23	Q	Okay.	23	A	No, I didn't say that. I hope I didn't say that
24	A	And they undoubtedly got back and confirmed with	24		because I didn't mean to say that.
25		me that you couldn't do better than 50 to	25	Q	I don't want to put words in your mouth.
		3	ı –~	~	to patorao in jour mount.

		Page 146			Page 148
1	A	I said that Exhibit 96 reminds me that there was	1	Q	And you're aware that minority groups, as they
2	**	an article about a group that was involved in the	2	Q	move into areas that were previously predominantly
3		aldermanic process here in Milwaukee County.	3		white or populated by people of Caucasian
4		-	4		ethnicities, European ethnicities, that sometimes
		I have no other recollection of knowing about this	5		, ,
5		group or other groups that might have been			those folks or in those neighborhoods react
6		involved at the aldermanic level in Milwaukee	6		negatively to the movement of the folks,
7	_	County or the city of Milwaukee.	7		minorities into their neighborhoods; correct?
8	Q	The fact of the matter is there was no effort to	8	A	No. I kind of no, I mean, I, you know, we all
9		contact anybody in Milwaukee's Latino community	9		read what goes on. I have not lived in a
10		during the month of June; am I right?	10		community where that has happened. I grew up in a
11		MR. HODAN: By whom?	11		community that was 40 percent Hispanic, and in
12		MR. EARLE: By anybody on the	12		that community there was never one part of town or
13		redistricting team.	13		another part of town. So and I'm aware in
14		THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't	14		Chicago, where my members of my family live, that
15		know that. That would be incorrect because I was	15		they live in communities in which Hispanic
16		in touch with MALDEF and	16		populations have moved in next door and nobody's
17		MR. EARLE:	17		moved out. So I don't think that's correct.
18	Q	I said the Latino community in Milwaukee.	18		Now, I am aware, but I have to add
19	A	Well, they were being encouraged to talk to the	19		that one of the things we looked at in 1990, 2000
20		community here in Milwaukee. I mean, I but	20		and in 2010 were the transitions that were
21		I had no connection. I mean, the answer is no,	21		occurring in both the African-American community
22	_	I didn't make any calls.	22		and in the Latino community here, and you can see
23	Q	What do you know about the, for lack of a better	23		that the very thing you're talking about. You
24		term, the cultural geography of the area	24		can see it demographically. You can see it on
25		surrounding Milwaukee's Latino community?	25		what I call heat maps that show the growth of
		Page 147			Page 149
1		MR. DAUGHTERY: Object to the extent	1		populations over time in certain areas. In fact,
2		in terms of ambiguous but subject to that, go	2		I've spoken about that.
3		ahead and answer.	3		And there's no question that in
4		THE WITNESS: I'm not terribly	4		Milwaukee based on those maps, that there has been
5		familiar with it. If you're talking about the	5		a tremendous growth in the Latino community in
6		surrounding area, my	6		certain directions that were fairly predictable
7	BY	MR. EARLE:	7		candidly even 20 years ago, ten years ago and the
8	0	Let me back up and since he objected to the term I	8		present. So that's what I know about it. I'm
9	4	used. It's I guess I can understand that.	9		not because I'm looking at it from that
10		It's a reasonable objection. I present to you the	10		perspective.
11		concept of a cultural geography, if you will. Do	11	Q	You sat here to say, though, that you don't know
12		you know what I mean when I say that?	12	~	anything about that transitioning neighborhood
13	A	No. I'm not trying to be difficult.	13		south of the old 8th assembly district?
14	Q	No, I'm going to clarify.	14	A	No, I have no I have no what I would call
15	A.	A lot of people could mean a lot of things.	15		really personal knowledge of that. No, I don't.
16	Q	But you recognize that in a city like Milwaukee	16		MR. EARLE: Let's pause for a second
17	Ą	you have neighborhoods that have an ethnic	17		and go off the record.
18		identity, ethnic identities of various types;	18		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
19		right?	19		the record at 7:25 p.m.
20	A	Wonderfully, yes.	20		(A recess was taken.)
21	Q	And you're also familiar with the idea that some	21		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
22	Ų	neighborhoods undergo racial or ethnic transitions	22		record at 7:37 p.m.
23		as a result of movement of ethnic groups over	23	pv	MR. EARLE:
24		time; correct?	24	Q	All right. Showing you what's been marked already
25	A	Yes, yes.	25	Ą	as Exhibit 176.
		, ,			

		Page 150			Page 152
1		MR. EARLE: I'm sure, Patrick, you're	1	A	No.
2		very well aware of this exhibit. You've seen it a	2	Q	All right. And I just want to be clear. The
3		lot in depositions.	3		section in the new Act 43 8th that was taken from
4	BY	MR. EARLE:	4		the old 9th, we talked earlier, this is the area
5	Q	This is an exhibit that was prepared at the	5		that you don't know anything about, correct, in
6		request of professor Ken Mayer, and what it shows	6		terms of what it's like as a neighborhood;
7		is an overlay of the 8th and 9th assembly	7		correct?
8		districts as currently configured over the old	8	A	I know the demographic statistics about these
9		assembly districts.	9		areas and the growth rates and where they were
10	A	So these are this 8th and 9th are the existing	10		going in the future and where they had been in the
11		presently, these are the proposed.	11		past, and that's what I utilized. But as I said
12	Q	8th and 9th are Act 43 in yellow.	12		before, I have spent no significant time in the
13	A	Okay this I apologize. Tell me again.	13		neighborhood.
14	Q	So 8 and 9 are the yellow lines and under Act 43.	14	Q	And as I used the term before and explained to you
15	A	Okay. So this is Act 43 and those are the old	15		the term "cultural geography," you didn't know
16		districts. Got it.	16		anything about the cultural geography of this area
17	Q	So that the tannish red is the old 8 and the kind	17		from the old 9th; correct?
18		of tan, tan or whatever color is the old 9th. And	18	A	The reason I hesitated when you said that is
19		there's a portion of the 19th assembly district in	19		obviously we all know, I mean, if we pay attention
20		darker red that was appended. See it? Now, it's	20		to Milwaukee, we all know something about these
21		accurate to say that the old 8th, when you you	21		various neighborhoods and, you know, but for me to
22		essentially chop the old 8th in half; correct?	22		suggest that I was an expert or anything like that
23	A	You know, so it looks like here visually.	23		would be just simply incorrect. I have not spent
24	Q	And you chop the old 9th basically in half as	24		a significant amount of time in the neighborhoods
25		well; correct?	25		on the south side of Milwaukee.
		Page 151			Page 153
1	A	Again, that visually that's what it appears.	1	Q	Okay. All right. Now, in drawing the new 8th,
2	Q	And then you took the eastern piece of half of the	2		the folks that actually did the the iterative?
3		old 8th and you attached to it the eastern piece	3	A	Ultimately put it in the computer.
4		of the old 9th; correct?	4	Q	Yeah, right. They did this under your
5	A	I like the attribution of you.	5		supervision. They ended up with 55.3 percent core
6		MR. HODAN: I was just you mean the	6		retention in that district; isn't that right?
7		legislature.	7	A	If that's what you say. I don't know. Without
8		MR. EARLE:	8		the statistics in front of me, I don't know.
9	Q	Well, no, I mean you. You drew this.	9	Q	I'll represent to you that the parties have
	A	I didn't. I didn't personally draw this.	10		stipulated to that fact.
11	Q	And presented it to the legislature; right?	11	A	Okay.
12		I did not draw this.	12	Q	Why such a dramatic movement of population?
13		I thought this was drawn under your supervision.	13		I mean, I guess let me just ask you the question
14 15	A Q	That would be very different than me drawing it. Well, it was drawn under your supervision. It was	14		straight out; all right? According to the facts
16	Ą	•	15 16		that we've stipulated to in this case, in order to equalize the population in the 8th assembly
17	A	drawn at your behest; correct? I don't even think that's correct. I think that	17		district, you and your colleagues drawing these
18		the map, the process by which this result occurred	18		maps had to move 2,800 and a certain
19		was iterative. It went through a series of steps	19		approximately 2,800 people. But you moved 22,000
20		to get to this final product and it was presented	20		people out and 25,000 people in to accomplish that
		to the legislature, so as one of three different	21		movement, that population adjustment of 2,800
2.1					people. So I ask you, why did you do that?
21 22		alternatives during the hearing on July 13th Was	1.7.		
22		alternatives during the hearing on July 13th. Was it three? I think it was three.	22	A	
22 23	0	it three? I think it was three.	23	A	I don't know. I mean, I did as I said, there's
22	Q			A	

		Page 154			Page 156
1		the changes that occur all over the state.	1		evaluate what the consequence of that notch on
2		There's an infinite variety there are an	2		16th Street or otherwise known as Cesar Chavez
3		variety of ways even of doing these two districts.	3		Drive was?
4		I do what's not shown on here is where JoCasta	4	A	I don't know.
5		lives. That usually is a significant factor when	5	0	Would it surprise you to know that in putting that
6		you're making these kinds of changes. Is she in	6	Ą	notch there, you took out of the 8th assembly
7		the new 8th?	7		district the single largest grocery store and the
8	Q	Yes, she is. She was not displaced.	8		single most important medical social service
9	A	Well, then it makes some sense, because	9		agency in the Latino community out of the 8th
10	Q	No, no, she's she lives but she's also	10		assembly district?
11	Q	living in the old 8th.		A	It would not surprise me one way or the other, and
	A	That's what I mean. But she's in this 8th, right?	12		I have to add that if you you could say the
13	0	Yes.	13		same thing about every assembly district in the
	A	Okay. Well, then, as I said, there's an	14		state of Wisconsin, because every assembly
15	**	innumerable policy factors and legislative factors	15		district in the state of Wisconsin is going to
16		and I don't want to try to speculate on how you	16		everybody locally is going to see it one way or
17		have to do it, but because of the infinite variety	17		another because there are an infinite number of
18		of things, one of the things that that's why	18		life choices that are made along the way.
19		I had this recollection, is in order to create	19		That happens to be one of the choices
20		a to make sure that this community would have	20		that was made along the way. You could choose to
21		the reasonable opportunity to elect in the second	21		do it differently. Ultimately from a legal
22		district, we want to I'm sure that one of the	22		perspective it would make no difference
23		factors was which one's open, which one isn't,	23		whatsoever, and so I wouldn't have known it and it
24		where the representative lives, where they don't,	24		simply wouldn't have been of any importance as a
25		and that kind of factor factors into this. And	25		legal perspective, from a legal perspective.
23		and that kind of factor factors into this. And	20		legal perspective, from a legal perspective.
		Page 155			Page 157
1		that's why I said I was trying to think, as you	1	Q	Well, to the extent you did not consult with
2		asked that question, I I don't remember why it	2		anybody who actually lived in the 8th assembly
3		went north and south versus east and west. I just	3		district; isn't that true?
4		don't remember. But there's just so many	4	A	I didn't personally. I think I whatever my
5		different factors that go into that.	5		testimony was, I did not personally talk to
6	Q	And drawing your attention to the line between the	6		somebody about it, no.
7		8th and 9th, I'll represent to you in the northern	7	Q	But nobody on the legal team talked to anybody who
8		part of the district there that's 16th Street or	8		actually lived in the 8th assembly district; isn't
9		what we've otherwise called Cesar Chavez Drive as	9		that true?
10		it's been renamed by the city.	10	A	That I don't know and because the legal aspect of
11	A	Okay.	11		this is only one aspect of how redistricting is
12	Q	There's a notch there. You see that notch?	12		done, that wouldn't surprise me.
13	A	I don't know which notch you've referring to.	13		MR. EARLE: Okay. All done. I'm
14	Q	Well, there's a notch as you go down the middle,	14		done.
15	·	there's a straight line and then there's a dog leg	15		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
16		to the right, a dog leg down and then a dog leg	16		MR. DAUGHTERY: Thank you.
17		back and it goes down again; right?	17		THE WITNESS: But I've got to go
18	A	Yes.	18		through him too.
19	Q	There's a little notch down on 16th Street. Why	19		MR. HODAN: Doug, about how long are
20	-	was that notch put in there?	20		you expecting to go?
21	A	I I don't know.	21		MR. POLAND: I'm hoping to be about a
22		Do you have any idea of the consequences of that	22		half an hour or so. I've got other things to run
1	Q				
23	Q	notch?	23		through, but that's what I'm hoping.
23 24	Q A	-	23 24		through, but that's what I'm hoping.
		notch?			through, but that's what I'm hoping.

		Page 158			Page 160
1		EXAMINATION	1		process, and among those were Joe and Tad, who had
2	DV	MR. POLAND:	2		stepped forward and I knew were interested and
			3		involved. So I would have contacted them because
3	Q	Mr. Troupis, I'm Doug Poland polled and I	4		
5		represent the Baldus plaintiffs in this case.	5		I assumed they were going to be ultimately on the
	A	Who are the Baldus plaintiffs?	6	Q	Ware you under contract or did you have on
6 7	Q A	It's a group of 23 citizens who are suing.	7	Ų	Were you under contract or did you have an agreement at that time, a retention agreement with
8		I'm just curious.	8		the Republican caucus?
9	Q	When were you retained by the legislature to work on what eventually the redistricting process	9	A	I don't think so. I don't think so but I don't
10		that eventually resulted in Acts 43 and 44?	10	A	remember. I was with Michael Best no. Was I
11	A	I think the letter of retention we talked about	11		with Michael Best at this point? No, I wasn't, so
12	Α.	this a little bit ago was probably around, was	12		I had left. I just don't remember. I don't
13		it around February of 2011 or January of 2011?	13		believe I was personally.
14		Sometime shortly after the new legislature.	14	Q	You don't believe you'd been retained personally
15		MR. POLAND: Can I mark this as an	15	Q	at that time?
16		exhibit.	16	A	I don't believe if by retained we mean paid,
17		(Exhibit No. 225 was marked for	17	Α.	the answer would be I don't believe so, but I have
18		identification.)	18		to the reason I'm hesitating is I have to check
19	DV	MR. POLAND:	19		my records and I just don't remember being
20	0	Mr. Troupis, I'd like you to take a look at	20		retained before the January or February time
21	Q	Exhibit 225 that the court reporter has just	21		frame.
22		handed to you and ask you if you can identify this	22	O	It may have been more of an advisory role; is that
23		document.	23	Q	fair to say?
24	A	I mean, I recognize my name's on it and I	24	A	Yes. You might call it client development role at
25		recognize it was written to a number of people on	25	A	this point.
23		recognize it was written to a number of people on	20		tins point.
		Page 159			Page 161
1		December the 14th.	1	Q	You can set that document aside. Do you still
2	Q	And	2		have Exhibit No. 188 in front of you?
3	A	And I recognize some of the content, but I don't	3	A	Yes.
4		recall the exact context.	4	Q	And we established before that this was the
5	Q	And I wanted to ask about the date because it's	5		engagement letter by which you, and I'll just say
6		dated December 14th, 2010. Do you see that?	6		it once and hopefully not to have repeat it again,
7	A	Yes, I do.	7		but the senate by its majority leader
8	Q	And you are addressing in Exhibit 225	8		Scott Fitzgerald apparently retained Michael Best
9		redistricting issues with Mr. Handrick, Mr. Ottman	9		& Friedrich?
10		and Mr. McLeod; is that correct?	10	A	Yes, that appears to be the case.
11	A	That's correct.	11	Q	I'd like to draw your attention to the bottom of
12	Q	All right. Do you recall whether you were	12		first page of Exhibit 188.
1.0		retained by the legislature or by anyone on or	13	A	Okay.
13		before December 4th, 2010 to work on redistricting	14	Q	And there is there is a statement at the very,
13		matters?	15		the very last line on that first page that says we
		matters:	10		
14	A	I think I just said that I thought I was retained	16		will represent the senate with respect to both
14 15	A				will represent the senate with respect to both litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to
14 15 16	A	I think I just said that I thought I was retained	16		-
14 15 16 17	A Q	I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in	16 17 18		litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to
14 15 16 17 18		I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011.	16 17 18	A	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see
14 15 16 17 18 19		I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011. Why would you have been speaking with Mr. Handrick	16 17 18 19	A Q	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see that?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20		I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011. Why would you have been speaking with Mr. Handrick and Mr. Ottman and Mr. McLeod about redistricting	16 17 18 19 20	_	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see that? Yes.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011. Why would you have been speaking with Mr. Handrick and Mr. Ottman and Mr. McLeod about redistricting matters if you hadn't yet been retained?	16 17 18 19 20 21	_	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see that? Yes. You had testified earlier in response to a
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011. Why would you have been speaking with Mr. Handrick and Mr. Ottman and Mr. McLeod about redistricting matters if you hadn't yet been retained? I believe I said in my earlier testimony that one	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	_	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see that? Yes. You had testified earlier in response to a question from Mr. Earle that it was anticipated
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	I think I just said that I thought I was retained in the early part of the new session, which was in January and February of 2011. Why would you have been speaking with Mr. Handrick and Mr. Ottman and Mr. McLeod about redistricting matters if you hadn't yet been retained? I believe I said in my earlier testimony that one of the things that we had been doing in the year	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	_	litigation and nonlitigation matters relating to the reapportionment representation. Do you see that? Yes. You had testified earlier in response to a question from Mr. Earle that it was anticipated initially from the outset of this process that the

1 A Yes. 2 Q That's one of the reasons that it was intended 3 that these documents be covered by an 4 attorney-client privilege. 5 A It was one of the reasons they are covered by the 6 attorney-client privilege. 7 Q Did you understand that your representation of 8 the of the senate and of the assembly by their 9 majority, their respective majority leaders was 10 also to be part of the or covered by the 11 attorney-client privilege? 12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did 13 would in substantial part be covered by an 14 attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that 16 it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective because I'm a trial 19 lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 21 hand you a document that previously has been 22 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 23 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, 1 think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tothere? 10 Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tothere? 11 A Tave no independent recollection right in the redistricting team? 1 I have no independent recollection right in the redistricting to the term. The proposal propo	I don't tat this st above the the that?
that these documents be covered by an attorney-client privilege. A It was one of the reasons they are covered by the attorney-client privilege. Did you understand that your representation of the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. A From my perspective because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? A From my perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so I don't think this is one that is going to be on the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 A Right, I went from the bottom. Page 163 A Right, I went from the bottom. Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail that the redistricting team? A Based upon this e-mail it appears be de dhave any independent recollection of tha have any independent recollection of tha have any independent recollection of the satterney. Po you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders, who are you refer to there? Do you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders, who are you refer to there? A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader about Mr. Handrick's invol in the redistricting process? A Were you responsible for approaching Mr. and asking hi	I don't tat this st above the the that?
that these documents be covered by an attorney-client privilege? A It was one of the reasons they are covered by the attorney-client privilege. 7 Q Did you understand that your representation of the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 10 also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 11 A Yes. 12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 13 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it is could very well go to litigation? 14 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 15 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so life in the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look A Okay. A Okay. A Right, I went from the bottom. G Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? A I'm what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be b. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 12 Were you were you one one of the pectors of the pound. 13 A Yes. 14 A Yes. 15 Q Do you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders about your few to there? 16 A That's what it appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on you recall speaking with strike that you dend that to there? 16 A The want it all that this is a reverse chronology. A Were you responsible for approaching Mr. and asking him to be part of the redistricting to the point. A The want it appears	I don't tat this stabove the the ce that?
A It was one of the reasons they are covered by the attorney-client privilege. 7 Q Did you understand that your representation of the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 10 also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 11 A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 13 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 14 From my perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 15 A From my perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 16 D You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 12 I don't think this is one that is going to be on the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look 11 A Ses. 12 A Okay. 12 A Okay. 13 A From my perspective because I'm a trial exhibit and a trial e	st above the the the the rring
4 attorney-client privilege. 7 Q Did you understand that your representation of the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 10 also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 11 A It was always my expectation that the work we did to their attorney-client privilege, yes. 12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did to tothere? 13 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 14 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 19 Iawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been arkhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 12 Were you were you one one of the peone of the peone. 13 Q Were you were you one one of the peone. 14 Lation shad if we jump up to the e-mail ye that, which is Friday, January 4th, 2011, that shad that, which is Friday, January 4th, 2011, that shad that they shad I what I wanted to assembly the majority leaders about your involvement. Do you so that the work we did that the work we did that the or between any our refe to there? 2 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to constituting process? 2 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-may shad asking him to be part of the redistricting process? 2 Q Were you responsible for approa	st above the the that?
7 Q Did you understand that your representation of the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was 10 also to be part of the or covered by the 11 attorney-client privilege? 11 A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 19 I awyer. 19 I at it. 19 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 19 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 Okay. 11 Were you -e ne of the peout that the work we did white in so the table in the content that previously has been 21 I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader about Mr. Handrick's involving in the redistricting process? 20 A I have no independent recollection right I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 22 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 10 Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 20 Q Were you were you one one of the peout that the work we did that the work we did to there? 20 Q Were you were you one one of the peout that the work we did that the work we did that the work we did to there? 20 Do you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders about your involvement. Do you sell leaders about your involvement. Do you sell leaders about your involvement. Do leaders about your involvement. Do leaders about your involvement. Do you sell lead	the the ce that? rring aker and
the of the senate and of the assembly by their majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. A A that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit no. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 at it. A Okay. Page 163 A Right, I went from the bottom. Q Ware you responsible for approaching Mr. and asking him to be part of the redistricting appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011, torrect? A Chart was in a part because I'm a trial lawyer. Page 163 A That's what it appears to be. A Right, I went from the bottom. A Right, I went from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011, correct? A Chart was always my expectation that the work we did to there? A Chart was always my expectation that the work we did to there? A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. B J don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the tredistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the tredistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the redistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the redistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the redistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the redistricting majority leader. D D you recall speaking with the speaker of the redistricting majority leader. D D you recall spea	the the ce that? rring aker and
majority, their respective majority leaders was also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. D And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. D Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 A Okay. Page 163 A Right, I went from the bottom. Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? A That's what It appears to be. It in third sentence in, you state I too spoke to leaders about your involvement. Do you so the leaders about your involvement. Do you so the leaders about your involvement. Do you so the leaders about your involvement. Do you so trick labout your erefet to there? A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. I have no independent recollection right I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. A Ay reason to believe that you didn't at it speak with them as indicated in your e-me speak with them as indicated in yo	the ee that? rring aker and
also to be part of the or covered by the attorney-client privilege? 12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 16 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 19 Iawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q Were you were you one one of the peo	ee that?
11 at it. 2 A It was always my expectation that the work we did 13 would in substantial part be covered by an 14 attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that 16 it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from 18 my personal perspective because I'm a trial 19 lawyer. 10 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 11 hand you a document that previously has been 12 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 13 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 14 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 15 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look 16 A Right, I went from the bottom. 17 Q Were you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders, who are you refer to there? 18 I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 19 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader about Mr. Handrick's involution in the redistricting process? 20 A I have no independent recollection right I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 21 I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 22 A Okay. 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak in the e-mails. That's who will be part of the redistricting team? 24 at it. 25 A Well, it says it in the e-mails. That's who will be part of the redistricting team? 25 A I don't know that I'd use the term "respon I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handri I have known each other a very long time. 26 Wore you were you one one of the people of the pool of the people of the peo	rring aker and
12 A It was always my expectation that the work we did 13 would in substantial part be covered by an 14 attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that 16 it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from 18 my personal perspective because I'm a trial 19 lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 10 hand you a document that previously has been 21 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 22 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-mail at it. 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look 26 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Do you recall speaking with strike that question. By the leaders, who are you refer to there? 12 to there? 14 to there? 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 17 Q Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tender. 18 majority leader. 19 Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tender. 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 12 Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tender. 14 to there? 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 16 Do you recall speaking with the speaker of the tenders. 17 Q Do you recall speaking with the speaker of majority leader. 18 Indon't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 18 I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 19 A I don't know that I'd use the term 'responsible for approaching Mr. and asking him to be part of the redistricting the	aker and
would in substantial part be covered by an attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 13 question. By the leaders, who are you refer to to there? 14 to there? 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 16 b Ji don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 17 Q Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 18 majority leader. 19 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 10 A Ji don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 11 D O you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 12 D O you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 13 D O you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 14 D O you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 16 D A Oyou recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 17 Q D oyou recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 18 I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 19 D A Well is an interdistricting process? 20 A I have no independent recollection right 11 I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don'	aker and
14 attorney-client privilege, yes. 15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that 16 it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from 18 my personal perspective because I'm a trial 19 lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 21 hand you a document that previously has been 22 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 23 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look 27 A Okay. 28 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 29 A Right, I went from the bottom. 4 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 4 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 to to there? 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 17 Q Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 18 I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 19 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 10 A Undon't know that I'd speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting	aker and
15 Q And that was in part because you anticipated that it could very well go to litigation? 17 A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial 19 lawyer. 10 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 15 A I don't know but I assume it was the spe majority leader. 16 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 17 Q Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 18 majority leader. 19 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 10 A That's what that is strue, yes, from 18 majority leader. 10 A Op you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 11 Po you call speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 12 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 12 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 16 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 18 majority leader. 10 Do you recall speaking with the speaker a majority leader. 10 A I have no independent recollection right In the redistricting process? 20 A I have no independent recollection right In the redistricting process? 21 I man, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't semember that. 22 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-may speak with them as indicated in your e-may speak with them as indicated in your e-may speak with them as ind	
it could very well go to litigation? A From my perspective that that's true, yes, from my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q Were you were you one one of the people and the list. I'll give you one one of the people were you one o	
17	nd the
my personal perspective because I'm a trial lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 18 majority leader about Mr. Handrick is involuing in the redistricting process? 20 A I have no independent recollection right I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 21 I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 22 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-mail speak w	nd the
19 lawyer. 20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 21 hand you a document that previously has been 22 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 23 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q Mere you were you one one of the peo	
20 Q You can set that document aside. I'm going to 21 hand you a document that previously has been 22 marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition 23 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 I have no independent recollection right I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 22 A Nay reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-me conclusions, but I don't remember that. 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-me 25 A Well, it says it in the e-mails. That's what I says. 2 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. and asking him to be part of the redistriction that I'd use the term "respon I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. wouldn't surprise me that he came and vision me. He was at that time and we talked it. 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q Were you were you one one of the people of the p	vement
hand you a document that previously has been marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-maximate at it. Page 163 at it. A Okay. A Okay. A Right, I went from the bottom. Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? A I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. I mean, I can read this and come to some conclusions, but I don't remember that. 22 A Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-maximate appears with them as indicated in your e-maximate and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of t	
marked as Exhibit No. 91. It was a deposition exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so I don't think this is one that is going to be on the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 at it. A Okay. Right, I went from the bottom. Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? A Il on't know that I'd use the term 'responsible for approaching the team? I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. Wouldn't surprise me that he came and visible for approaching Mr. I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. Wouldn't surprise me that he came and visible for approaching Mr. I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. Wouldn't surprise me that he came and visible for approaching Mr. A That's what it appears to be. All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting Were you were you one one of the people of the people for approaching Mr. A Well, it says it in the e-mails. That's what it don't know that I'd use the term 'responsible for approaching Mr. and asking him to be part of the redistriction that team? A I don't know that I'd use the term 'responsible for approaching Mr. I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. Wouldn't surprise me that he came and visible for approaching Mr. All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting Were you were you one one of the people for approaching Mr. Were you were you one one of the people for approaching Mr. Were you were you one one of the people for approaching Mr. A Well, it at it. A Well, it at it. A Well, it says it in the e-mails. A Well, it at it. A Well in the don't remember that. A Well in the the t	now.
23 exhibit and a trial exhibit as well, and so 24 I don't think this is one that is going to be on 25 the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 23 Q Any reason to believe that you didn't at the speak with them as indicated in your e-mail 24 speak with them as indicated in your e-mail 25 A Well, it says it in the e-mails. That's what it appears to be on 26 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 27 and asking him to be part of the redistriction and asking him to be part of the redistriction to team? 28 I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 3 I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 4 team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 6 I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrid I have known each other a very long time. 8 wouldn't surprise me that he came and visually the wouldn't surprise me that he came and visually the wouldn't surprise me that time and we talked it. 10 Were you were you one one of the people	
I don't think this is one that is going to be on the list. I'll give you a moment to take a look Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 Mr. That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 124 speak with them as indicated in your e-mail appears to he and with them as indicated in your e-mail speak with them as indicated in your e-mail appears to he and with the design in the e-mails. That's what I'd use the term "responded team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responded team? 6 I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handridand in the production of the producti	
Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what I appears to be. 1 well, it says it in the e-mails. That's what I says. 2 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 3 and asking him to be part of the redistricting team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 4 team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 6 I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handright in the e-mails. That's what I'd use the redistricting team? 9 I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handright in the e-mails in the e-mails. That's what I'd use the redistricting team? 1 I have known each other a very long time. 1 wouldn't surprise me that he came and visually the proposed of the people of the peo	at time
Page 163 1 at it. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 1 says. 2 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 3 and asking him to be part of the redistricting and asking him to be part of the redist	il?
1 says. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse chronology. 4 team? 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse and asking him to be part of the redistriction and as	it it
2 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 3 Q Mr. Troupis, I think that this is a reverse 4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 12 Q Were you responsible for approaching Mr. 3 and asking him to be part of the redistricting team? 4 team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responsible for approaching Mr. 6 I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrick wouldn't surprise me that he came and vision me. He was at that time and we talked it. 10 it. 11 Q Were you were you one one of the people of the people wouldn't surprise me that he came and vision me. He was at that time and we talked it.	Page 165
3	
4 chronology. 5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 4 team? 5 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responted in the came and vision in the came and vision in the came and vision in the came and we talked	Handrick
5 A Right, I went from the bottom. 6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's 7 what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail 8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 15 A I don't know that I'd use the term "responted in I think I expressed earlier that Joe Handrick I have known each other a very long time. 8 wouldn't surprise me that he came and visually me. He was at that time and we talked 10 it. 11 Q Were you were you one one of the people of t	ıg
6 Q Okay, terrific. I'm glad you did that. That's what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 me. He was at that time and we talked it. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Q Were you were you one one of the people of the peop	
what I wanted to ask you about. The bottom e-mail appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you on January 14th, 2011; correct? A That's what it appears to be. A All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting Thave known each other a very long time. wouldn't surprise me that he came and vis me. He was at that time and we talked to it.	sible."
8 appears to be an e-mail from Mr. Handrick to you 9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 me. He was at that time and we talked 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Q Were you were you one one of the peo	ck and
9 on January 14th, 2011; correct? 9 me. He was at that time and we talked 10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Q Were you were you one one of the peo	So it
10 A That's what it appears to be. 11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Q Were you were you one one of the peo	ited with
11 Q All right. And Mr. Handrick refers to a meeting 11 Q Were you were you one one of the peo	ıbout
	ple or
that he had with Senator Fitzgerald, the previous 12 the person who recommended Mr. Handrick	
13 week; correct? 13 retained to work in the redistricting process	
14 A That's what it says. 14 A I would not be so arrogant to suggest that	
15 Q And Mr. Handrick's e-mail also says that 15 Joe Handrick is well known in the Capitol	
reports that Senator Fitzgerald had asked him to 16 well known in for his involvement in redis	_
get together with you, Mr. Troupis, and/or 17 going back 20 years. So I doubt I was the	sole
18 Mr. McLeod to figure out how to structure his source of much of anything there.	ļ
involvement with the team; correct? Do you see 19 Q You can set that document aside. Were the	ŀ
20 that? 20 other members of the redistricting team the	
21 A Again, that's what it appears to say, yes. 21 spoke with in early 2011 about participating	it you
22 Q All right. Do you know by the team, is he 22 the process?	it you
23 referring to the redistricting team that was being 23 A I assume I did.	it you
24 put together? 24 MR. POLAND: Actually this is alread 25 A That's what I understood. 25 marked so we don't have to worry about the	t you g in
25 A That's what I understood. 25 marked so we don't have to worry about the	it you g in

		Page 166			Page 168
1		Again, I think Don, I think that the documents	1		might have been but it wouldn't have been uncommon
2		that have previously been marked, I don't think we	2		if I said working on it that it might have been
3		have to worry about.	3		Eric McLeod or Ray Taffora at this point.
4		MR. DAUGHTERY: Okay, great. Thank	4	Q	Now, the next sentence in that middle e-mail you
5		you.	5	4	say Keith Gaddie is on board now as well. Do you
6		THE WITNESS: Yes.	6		see that statement?
7	BV	MR. POLAND:	7	Α	Yes, I do.
8	0	And again we have a reverse chron order here, so	8	Q	What are you referring to there?
9	Q	I'd like to start at the bottom of this e-mail	9	A	I must have given him a call, I guess. I don't
10		chain. The first e-mail appears to be an e-mail	10		have any independent recollection of when I first
11		from Mr. Handrick to you dated January 24th, 2011.	11		talked to Keith, Professor Gaddie. But I must
12		Do you see that?	12		have based on this I must have talked to him
13	A		13		somehow to know that he would be willing to
14	0	Yes, I do.	14		-
	Ų	And I'd like to jump to the second line down. Do	15	0	participate. You knew Dr. Gaddie before this time then?
15		you see where Mr. Handrick asks you the question	16	Q A	
16		did you finish your consult retention memo yet.			Oh, yes.
17	A	I thought you were going to ask about Moscow.	17	Q	Fair to say?
18	Q	No.	18	A	Yes.
19	A	There's another story behind that part.	19	Q	Had you worked with him on redistricting
20	Q	If we had more time I'd love to hear that one.	20		litigation previously?
21		Maybe over a beer sometime.	21		Yes, I had.
22	A	There we go. Did you finish your consult and	22	Q	Was that back in 2002?
23		retention memo yet. Is that the question?		A	That's correct.
24	Q	Yes.	24	Q	Anytime before that?
25	A	Okay. What's the question?	25	A	I don't remember anytime before that. Could have
		Page 167			Page 169
1	Q	The question is what is that referring to?	1		been. Professor Gaddie's well known, you know,
2	A	I think at about this time it was reflected in the	2		and so I could have had some involvement with him
3		prior e-mail there was a discussion going on on	3		before that time.
4		what type of retention Mr. Handrick would be	4	Q	Do you know whether you were the first one to
5		involved with, and I think I reflected earlier on	5		reach out to Professor Gaddie for the purpose of
6		the question had been raised whether he'd be on an	6		working on the 2011 redistricting?
7		hourly basis or whether he'd be on a monthly	7	A	I don't know if I was the first one or not.
8		retention. So I assume that's what this is	8		Joe Handrick and Professor Gaddie Joe had been
9		referring to. At the time we were probably	9		featured in a book that Professor Gaddie did, and
10		talking about and someone was supposed to prepare	10		so I know that he had a different kind of
11		something that would then be exchanged on that	11		friendship with him than I did. So he might have
12		question.	12		talked to him.
13	Q	And then if you jump up to the e-mail directly	13	Q	The very next sentence continues on to say still
14	·	above, you'll see that you respond to Mr. Handrick	14	c	trying to get to Dr. Grofman. Do you see that?
15		that same day a short time later and you say	15	A	Yes, I do.
16		working on it. Do you see that?	16	Q	And what are you referring to there?
17	A	Yes, do.	17	A	I'm talking about Dr. Bernie Grofman.
18	Q	Does that indicate that you were working on	18	Q	Were you attempting at this time also to get
19	Y	Mr. Handrick's consult and retention memo?	19	Ą	Dr. Grofman to participate in the redistricting
20	A	It could mean that. It could mean when I said	20		process?
21		working on it, it could be that the team that	21	A	This is an embarrassment. I think at this point
22		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	л	-
23		Eric McLeod was working on it. At this point in time I was preparing for a major trial, I think I	23		in time I was underwater and I didn't get ahold of Dr. Grofman until much later. So when I said
24			23		
25		told you before, for the Sandisk Corporation. So	25		I was still trying, that's the appropriate word is trying. I don't believe that I had direct contact
23		it was being wedged in among a lot of tasks. So I	40		aying. I don't beneve that I had direct contact

		Page 170			Page 172
1		with him for many months later.	1		drafted a retention letter?
2	Q	We have a few documents here that we'll walk	2	A	Right.
3	Q	through the sequence and I think that might show.	3	0	All right. So by that time, by January 31st,
4	A	That's again, if that's not correct, but that's	4	Ą	2011, it was your understanding Professor Gaddie
5		what my recollection is now.	5		had agreed that he would work as a consultant
6		MR. POLAND: You can set that document	6	A	No.
7		to the side. Don, here's one. I don't know that	7	Q	on the redistricting process?
8		this is on our list. You can take a look and see.	8	A	No. At this point in time I was drafting a
9		And I'm just going to ask about that first one,	9		retention letter. So he was undoubtedly, I would
10		number 21 there.	10		assume, waiting for something to look at and I was
11		MR. DAUGHTERY: Twenty-one, that's	11		circulating it to Eric, because I think, and
12		fine. 21 is fine.	12		I could be mistaken on this, but I would assume
13		MR. POLAND: Actually can I take that	13		that the eventual retention letter came from
14		one back?	14		Michael Best and not from me, but I would have
15		(Exhibit No. 226 was marked for	15		drafted language about that.
16		identification.)	16	Q	And just below that it appears you're still trying
17	BY	MR. POLAND:	17	~	to make contact with Mr. Grofman at that point or
18	0	Mr. Troupis, the court reporter has handed you	18		Dr. Grofman at that point?
19	Ą	Exhibit 226. You certainly are free to read all	19	A	Yes. As I told you, the embarrassment here, yes.
20		these if you'd like. I'm only going to ask you	20	Q	Certainly don't mean to embarrass you.
21		about the very first one on the first page.	21	A	No. I still feel badly because I do like
22	A	Let me at least familiarize myself with what this	22		Professor Grofman a great deal.
23		is.	23	Q	The next sentence down, you are talking about
24	Q	Of course.	24	Ψ.	bills and there is a statement there that you were
25	A	Okay. I think the only two that I I guess I	25		making, monthly statement amount due from the
20		only. I think the only two that I I guess I			manny, monany etatement amount and non-time
		Page 171			Page 173
1		wanted to look through. I didn't recognize the	1		trust, one line total from MB&F. Once initialed,
2		rest of them. I don't know that I was ever copied	2		MB&F will issue appropriate payment. That refers
3		on any of those others. The only two that I	3		to the arrangement that you had testified about
4		appear to be on is 21 and 22.	4		earlier in response to a question from Mr. Earle;
5	Q	That's right, and 21 is the only one that I intend	5		is that correct?
6	·	to ask you about.	6	A	I'm not sure what you're referring to. I think,
7	A	Okay.	7		I think it's referring to the Handrick arrangement
8	Q	So 21 is an e-mail from you dated January 31st,	8		by this point in time, but I'm not certain of
9	·	2011; correct?	9		that, so I I'm guessing that's true.
10	A	Seems to be that.	10	Q	Is it fair
11	Q	And you were sending this to Mr. Ottman and	11	A	Contextually it appears to be correct.
12	·	Mr. Foltz; correct?	12	Q	Is it fair to say that the way that the payments
13	A	Yes, and copied to a number of others.	13		worked is that there was a trust that was set up
14	Q	All right. Is it your understanding that you	14		and then Michael Best & Friedrich would pay the
15	τ	would have been engaged certainly at least to	15		outside consultants and lawyers who were retained?
16		represent the senate and the assembly by their	16	A	Yes, that's correct.
17		respective majority leaders by this time?	17	Q	And then the very next line down, there's a
18	A	I would have interpreted it that way but we need	18	~	statement, meeting with legislators, you're each
19	-	to be a little careful here because we lawyers	19		about to start those. Do you see that?
20		tend to get out in front of formal retentions and	20	A	Yes.
21		I don't know that I was being paid for this or	21	Q	To what does that refer?
22		retained in that sense. I certainly understood	22	A	Well, the process the process of redistricting
23		I was going to be retained by this point and was	23	٠	has as an important element, actual ongoing
24		working on the projects that you see there.	24		meetings with members of the legislature to
25	Q	And there was a reference to Professor Gaddie	25		determine what was important to them. At this
	•				-

Page 174 Page 176 stage you wouldn't be talking about districts. Α Yes. 1 1 2 You would be talking about, well, what's important 2 Q Do you see in the first paragraph it appears that 3 to you, what's really important to you. Some of 3 they're not attached to this e-mail, this 4 them say, you know, Grandma Moses' farm on the 4 document, but it appears that you were sending 5 east end of Polk County, and some of them say 5 three draft letters of retention; correct? 6 I don't care and some of them might say I'm 6 Α Yes. As I said before, we were working on --7 retiring. 7 there was wording that that was being put together 8 8 And so the process begins with the Tad and I apparently had put something of that wording 9 and Adam consulting with the various members of 9 together. 10 the legislature to determine what they consider to 10 Q It appears to reflect --11 be important before you start thinking about how 11 Α The wording that I previously said when I said we 12 you would draw maps and it's the beginning of the 12 were working on the retention letters, now 13 13 apparently I had done some drafts or something and 14 Q At that time was it the intention to have 14 sent them along. 15 Mr. Ottman and Mr. Foltz consult with members of 15 Q Now, the third paragraph down in your e-mail 16 both the majority part and the minority party or 16 states: I have kept these purposely vague on the 17 simply the majority party at that point? 17 assumption they may one day be made public. There 18 Α I don't know. 18 is, for example, no description of how Joe would 19 O 19 Did you ever instruct them to meet only with the report his time and no allegation he provide 20 20 majority members? detail. Do you see that? 21 I did not. 21 A Mm-hm. Α 22 Q Did you ever instruct them not to meet with any of 22 Q And was --23 the members of the minority party? 23 Α Yes. I do. 24 24 Q Does that refer also to Mr. Earle's question to Α 25 O You can set that document aside. 25 you earlier, I think you had a question and answer Page 177 Page 175 MR. DAUGHTERY: That's fine. Let's go about that? 1 1 2 ahead and mark that. 2 Α I -- we talked about Mr. Handrick's retention. 3 (Exhibit No. 227 was marked for 3 I do remember that. 4 identification.) 4 Q All right. And it was -- was it for the purpose 5 BY MR. POLAND: 5 of litigation that you kept the retention letters 6 Mr. Troupis, the court reporter has handed you 6 purposely vague? 7 Exhibit 227. I'll give you a minute here to look 7 No. As I reflected down below, there was no need 8 8 for that. In the second-to-last paragraph I 9 9 actually point out that given the relationship, MR. HODAN: Doug, it's 8:15 at night 10 10 and we're talking about retention letters still? there just was -- it was simply not necessary. So 11 MR. POLAND: Yes, we are. I've only 11 I -- so among the reasons, I just didn't think it 12 been asking questions for about 20 minutes. 12 was necessary and, in fact, I wanted to see Joe 13 13 MR. HODAN: I understand. I'm just work as hard as he would. 14 wondering how this is relevant to what we're going 14 Q Why would it not be necessary for both Joe and 15 15 Keith Gaddie not to have to have a comprehensive to be talking about at trial tomorrow or Friday. 16 MR. POLAND: Okay. You'll find out. 16 time description? 17 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 Because normally the reason you would have that is 18 BY MR. POLAND: 18 because you're concerned that perhaps people will 19 Okay. Can you identify Exhibit 227, please? 19 0 overcharge or undercharge -- not undercharge --20 Α Well, it appears to be an e-mail from me to a 20 generally overcharge and you want to make sure 21 21 number of people and then an e-mail from that they're doing the tasks that you're asking. 22 Tad Ottman to me and a number of people dated 22 In this instance, I knew both Professor Gaddie and 23 February 9 and February 11 respectively, 2011. 23 Joe Handrick and that certainly was not any kind 24 I'd like to start with the e-mail from you to 24 of a concern that I would have had at that moment 25 Mr. McLeod that February 9th e-mail. 25 in time.

		Page 178			Page 180
1	Q	Did you also have a concern, though, that you did	1	Q	And when you say I'm sorry, did you say
2	٠	not want their task descriptions to be made	2		membership groups?
3		public?	3	A	Yes.
4	A	Well, you know, as with any expert, any trial	4	Q	What do you mean by membership groups?
5		lawyer who's worth their salt is not going to have	5	A	Well, groups that have members from around the
6		the experts describe everything going on because	6		state that often that are in Madison, that have
7		it reveals certain work product and litigation	7		offices in Madison.
8		strategies and the like. So this is a very common	8	Q	Okay. Can you give me examples of the membership
9		understanding. There's nothing uncommon about	9		groups?
10		that, if that's where you're thinking I was going.	10	A	Oh, sure. The ones I remember, and I don't
11		But as I told you, my view was it just was not	11		remember candidly I don't remember who was
12		necessary.	12		there, but I do remember that the WMC, Jim Buchen,
13		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Excuse me. Two	13		I believe Jim was there. Maybe not, but I thought
14		minutes of disk.	14		there was representatives from WMC. I know that
15		MR. POLAND: Why don't we just go	15		there would have been a representative from the
16		ahead and change the tape now. Let's go off the	16		realtors. Liki Theo, L-I-K-I, a fellow Greek, and
17		record.	17		I think the bankers, but that's the type of group.
18		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends disk	18		But I may be incorrect on those three because
19		number two of the video deposition of James R.	19		I don't remember for sure who was there, but I do
20		Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time, 8:15 p.m.	20		remember that's the type of group that was being
21		(Discussion off the record.)	21		invited.
22		(Exhibit No. 228 was marked for	22	Q	There is a statement by Mr. Handrick after that
23		identification.)	23		that says: Tad and I thought maybe it's better
24		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the	24		not to have me there but I certainly can be if you
25		beginning of disk number three of the video	25		wish.
		Page 179			Page 181
1		deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22,	1	A	Yes.
2		2012. The time, 8:20 p.m.	2	Q	Do you know why it was thought perhaps that it
3	BY	MR. POLAND:	3		would be better not to have Mr. Handrick there?
4	Q	Mr. Troupis, the court reporter has handed you a	4	A	Honestly I don't know but I mean, I could
5		document that we've marked as Exhibit No. 228.	5		speculate but I don't know.
6		Can you identify it for the Court, please?	6	Q	Well, if you want to speculate, I'll be happy to
7	A	Well, it appears to be a series of e-mails from or	7		hear what you have to say.
8		to me and Joe Handrick.	8	A	Better not speculate.
9	Q	I'd like to draw your attention to the very last	9		MR. DAUGHTERY: I instruct the witness
10		e-mail that appears on the last page	10		not to speculate.
11	A	Yes.	11		THE WITNESS: Don't speculate, Jim.
12	Q	of page 1 and then page 2. It appears to be	12		It's late. You know better.
13	A	The one dated January 28, 2011, 4:27 p.m.?	13	BY	MR. POLAND:
14	Q	Yes, correct. I believe all the text is contained	14	Q	Let's go up to the e-mail just above that.
15		on the second page. Mr. Handrick says to you are	15		There's an e-mail from you to Mr. Handrick on
16		you expecting me on Monday for the meeting with	16		Saturday, January 29th.
17		the private groups. Do you see that?	17	A	Yes.
18	A	Yes, I do.	18	Q	And you say: I will defer to Tad on this. It
19	Q	What is Mr. Handrick referred to by private	19		appears to be referring to the previous question.
20		groups?	20	A	That's why I said that, that I can surmise certain
21	A	If I remember the dates correctly, at about this	21		things from this one actually.
22		time there was a there was going to be a	22	Q	You then say in your message: I think for you
23		meeting involving a number of the large membership	23		that maintaining the appearance of independence is
24		groups that are in Madison to explain the process	24		potentially very important and lucrative for you.
25		that we were about to begin for redistricting.	25		What did you mean, maintaining the appearance of

		Page 182			Page 184
1		independence?	1		MR. EARLE: Just for the record, that
2	A	What did I mean? I hope that you asked Joe about	2		last comment was with levity as well.
3	•	this, and I don't mean to misstate what Joe's	3		THE WITNESS: Okay, please.
4		intentions were at the time. Joe had just joined	4		MR. EARLE: Sometimes when comments
5		the Reinhart firm just prior to this. He had got	5		that are intended to be and, in fact, are with
6		married or was about to get married and he was	6		levity don't appear necessarily that way.
7		moving back to Milwaukee or Madison.	7		THE WITNESS: Thank you. I
8	Q	Port Washington, I think, perhaps?	8		appreciate that.
9	A	It is Port Washington where he's living? I knew	9		MR. POLAND: We do have the videotape
10		it was Milwaukee area. And in the lobbying	10		as well.
11		practice, which is what he would be doing, it's	11		THE WITNESS: Let me take a second. I
12		having maintaining that level of independence	12		want to refresh my recollection what this was.
13		from the speaker or majority leader or us, me,	13		(Exhibit No. 229 was marked for
14		whomever, or Michael Best, was would be	14		identification.)
15		important, if you're going to build an effective	15	BY	MR. POLAND:
16		lobbying practice, you kind of have to make	16	Q	Okay. So you've taken a look again at
17		choices and at this point I doubt Joe had made his	17	-	Exhibit 220, Mr. Troupis?
18		choices, what he was going to emphasize, what he	18	A	Yes.
19		might want to sell, so to speak, in the rest of	19	Q	I'm going to hand you a document the court
20		his practice.	20		reporter has marked as Exhibit No. 229. I'd like
21		And so that I would surmise from this	21		to give you a minute to take a look at that
22		that, you know, he didn't for his sake it might	22		document. Mr. Troupis, have you seen Exhibit 229
23		be better to not be associated so early and so	23		before?
24		directly with the speaker and majority leader.	24	A	I don't recall seeing this before.
25	Q	Was that essentially counsel or guidance you were	25	Q	I'd like you to take a look at the second page of
		Page 192			Page 195
		Page 183			Page 185
1		giving to him in that message?	1		Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified
2	A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should	2	•	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc?
2 3	A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be	2 3	A	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't
2 3 4	A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were	2 3 4		Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it.
2 3 4 5	A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it	2 3 4 5	A Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to
2 3 4 5 6	A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took	2 3 4 5 6		Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement
2 3 4 5 6 7		giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A BY	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A BY Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A BY Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover. I don't mean to be I'm not purposely trying to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what I was going to ask you. It's reasonable to assume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A BY Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover. I don't mean to be I'm not purposely trying to go slow here. I can't find it. Oh, there it is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what I was going to ask you. It's reasonable to assume that. If you look at the very first paragraph of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A BY Q A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover. I don't mean to be I'm not purposely trying to go slow here. I can't find it. Oh, there it is. It's the bottom one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what I was going to ask you. It's reasonable to assume that. If you look at the very first paragraph of Exhibit 229, you see that the at the very end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A BY Q A	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover. I don't mean to be I'm not purposely trying to go slow here. I can't find it. Oh, there it is. It's the bottom one. You recognize, this is karma. This is payback for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what I was going to ask you. It's reasonable to assume that. If you look at the very first paragraph of Exhibit 229, you see that the at the very end of that first paragraph it states that the well, strike that question. The very first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	giving to him in that message? Yes. Joe had talked to me about whether he should join the Reinhart firm and whether that would be the right move for him. I told you we were friends and we go back a long way. I told him it would be a brilliant move and apparently he took my advice. You can set that document to the side. Mr. Troupis, do you still have Exhibit 220 in front of you? That's was Reinhart engagement letter. I don't know. The stack's getting kind of big here. We have a few more to add to it. I'll tell you MR. DAUGHTERY: Here, looks like this. MR. POLAND: It has an e-mail on the front cover. I don't mean to be I'm not purposely trying to go slow here. I can't find it. Oh, there it is. It's the bottom one. You recognize, this is karma. This is payback for doing this to other witnesses.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	Exhibit 229. Do you see that you are identified as a cc? Yes, I do, now that you mention it, but I don't recall it. I'd like you to just refer your attention back to Exhibit 220, which is the Reinhart engagement letter, the February 17th letter? Yes. Do you see in the very first line of that letter it states: Please find enclosed the engagement letter of February 15, 2011? Do you see that? This is the mysterious letter, yes. Is it your understanding that that references to Exhibit 229? I have no understanding one way or the other. I mean, it's reasonable to assume that given the dates. I told you I just don't recognize it. You beat me to the next question. That's what I was going to ask you. It's reasonable to assume that. If you look at the very first paragraph of Exhibit 229, you see that the at the very end of that first paragraph it states that the

		Page 186			Page 188
1	A	It appears to, yes.	1	BY	MR. POLAND:
2	Q	And it also states that the matter involves	2	Q	Okay. Mr. Troupis, have you seen Exhibit No. 230
3		potential litigation; correct?	3		before?
4	A	Yes, that's what it says.	4	A	I must have in reading it.
5	Q	And if you jump down three paragraphs below that,	5		MR. HODAN: Is this 230 or 234?
6		the letter states: As this retention is in	6		THE WITNESS: 230.
7		anticipation of potential litigation, all matters	7	BY	MR. POLAND:
8		must remain confidential until such time as the	8	Q	Mr. Troupis, this is an e-mail that you sent to a
9		client determines otherwise. Do you see that?	9		number of people on Friday, April 1st; correct,
10	A	Yes, I do.	10		2011?
11	Q	Do you ever recall drafting language like that for	11	A	That's what it appears, yes.
12		an engagement letter for Mr. Handrick?	12	Q	And you'll see that you at least direct your
13	A	This is my recollection is this is pretty	13		comments, it appears, to Mr. Ottman and Mr. Foltz?
14		standard Michael Best & Friedrich expert retention	14	A	Yes.
15		letter and you would normally put in a clause to	15	Q	You state in the first sentence of your e-mail:
16		that effect in any retention letter of an expert	16	-	Finally heard back from Gaddie yesterday and after
17		or consultant in these kind of cases. So my	17		talking things through with him, and then in
18		I don't know whether I drafted it or somebody else	18		parens, in briefly visiting last week with Joe H.,
19		did, but I do know that my recollection is that	19		it seems the best time for him to come out would
20		this is this is standard language.	20		be April 29th through 30, May 3 through 6, or
21	Q	The subject matter line of Exhibit 229	21		anytime after that in May. Do you see that?
22	A	The re line.	22	A	Yes, I do.
23	Q	The re line, you see it states Wisconsin state	23	Q	Does that refer to Mr. or Dr. Gaddie coming to
24		senate by its majority leader Scott R. Fitzgerald	24		Madison?
25		and the Wisconsin state assembly by its speaker	25	A	Yes, it does.
		Page 187			Page 189
1		Jeff Fitzgerald, dash, 2011, dash, 12	1	Q	When was the first time that Dr. Gaddie came to
2		redistricting. Do you see that?	2		Madison to work on the redistricting in 2011?
3	A	Yes, I do.	3	A	I don't know.
4	Q	Are you aware of any other description of the	4	Q	Did you ever meet with him when he came to Madison
5		scope of the representation for which Mr. Handrick	5		for the purpose of redistricting?
6		was retained?	6	A	I think that was asked a little bit earlier.
7	A	Again, there's a couple of letters here regarding	7		Here's the irony of this e-mail and you saw me
8		that, and I don't recall anything other than the	8		chuckle a second ago. One of the reasons
9		letters we're talking about.	9		April 29th and May 3rd were chosen was because
10	Q	Did you ever have a conversation with Mr. Handrick	10		I was supposed to leave for Australia on April the
11		about the scope of his services?	11		4th or 5th and that's the plane I was on headed to
12	A	I think I've already said it several times that	12		the West Coast when I got a call from Mr. Justice
13		Joe would be assisting in this process and I had	13		Prosser to get off the plane and come back. So
14		no concerns at all that he would be giving us fair	14		I was supposed to be back at the end of the month
15		measure in that process. So I and he would	15		and I never took that trip and my family did, and
16		take assignments from the lawyers or the majority	16		that was the reason those dates were chosen.
17		leader, whatever it happened to be.	17		As it turned out, by the time he
18	Q	You can set that document to the side. We just	18		arrived, which was either late April or early May,
19		got shorter by a few minutes.	19		I had absolutely no time to meet with him. And so
20	A	Thank you. Thank you, judge, whichever judge.	20		I may have broken away at some point and met with
21		MR. DAUGHTERY: Judge Dow. Thank you,	21		him when he was here, but I don't remember the
22		Judge Dow.	22		dates and the whole time period is a blur.
23		(Exhibit No. 230 was marked for	23		However, he did come out and have drinks with me
24		identification.)	24		at the Village Green in Middleton, Wisconsin, one
25			25		night, and that I do remember.

		Page 190			Page 192
1	Q	Do you recall ever meeting with Professor Gaddie	1	Q	And the date is May 9th, 2011?
2	Q	at the Michael Best & Friedrich offices during the	2	A	That's what it appears to be.
3		redistricting process?	3	0	Professor Gaddie asks that you refresh his memory
4	A	I have no independent recollection but that is	4	Q	on an issue. He asks: Is the disenfranchisement
5	А	absolutely not to say that I didn't, because at	5		issue in the Wisconsin senate a concern under the
6		that time we were quite literally working 18 hours	6		Wisconsin state constitution or statute?
7		a day, seven days a week.	7	A	He actually misspelled. It could be
8	Q	On the redistricting?	8		disfranchisement. Just so you know, I'm not the
9	A.	Mr. Justice Prosser's recount.	9		·
			_	0	only one and Peter with bad typing skills.
10	Q	Okay. Do you recall working at all with	10	Q	I do the same thing. I think we're all in the
11		Professor Gaddie where any maps were displayed or	11		same boat. And continuing on, he says: Or is
12		shown or created?	12		this an equal protection issue arising under the
13	A	You know, he must have been in early June of 2011.	13		14th amendment. If you can direct me to an
14		I thought that he came twice and I thought that he	14		appropriate citation, I would appreciate the
15		was present at some of the meetings in early	15		assistance. Do you see that?
16		I think it was early June of 2011. Again, there's	16	A	Yes.
17		probably e-mails that will give you the exact	17	Q	Do you recall Professor Gaddie asking this
18		dates. And I thought that he was present at those	18		question of you?
19		meetings when we were looking at regional maps.	19	A	No, I don't.
20		So that's that's my recollection. But I don't	20	Q	Do you ever recall responding to him?
21		think in this earlier time period I certainly	21	A	No. I might have. I just don't recall that.
22		don't have any recollection of I've told you	22	Q	Do you recall ever asking Professor Gaddie
23		before even of the meeting, which doesn't mean it	23		specifically to look at the senate
24	_	didn't happen.	24	_	disenfranchisement issue?
25	Q	Was Professor Gaddie asked to look at any specific	25	A	I don't. Again, I might have but I don't recall
		Page 191			Page 193
1		regions or any specific areas of the state?	1		me doing that.
2	A	Not that I recall, no, but he might have been. I	2	Q	Do you recall speaking with him at all about the
3		just don't recall that.	3		senate disenfranchisement issue?
4	Q	And there were others on the redistricting team	4	A	Well, we must have. You know, because it's
5		who were working with him directly?	5		something that, you know, we watched. So we must
6	A	Correct, correct.	6		have but I don't have any independent recollection
7	Q	Do you recall seeking out Professor Gaddie's	7		of anything talking about it.
8		expertise or opinions in any specific area of the	8	Q	Do you recall just generally speaking anything
9		redistricting, be it a geographic other or a	9		that Professor Gaddie had to say on the topic
10		topical area?	10		during the redistricting process?
11	A	Nothing, you know, separate or distinct from the	11	A	No, no.
12		general tasks that we had. I just don't remember	12		(Exhibit No. 231 was marked for
13		any. Probably did but I don't remember anything	13		identification.)
14		specifically.	14	BY	MR. POLAND:
15	Q	You can set that to the side. This is a document	15	Q	Mr. Troupis, the court reporter has handed you a
16	-	that we've previously marked as Exhibit No. 69 at	16		document that's been marked as Exhibit 231.
17		deposition and trial.	17	A	Yes.
18	A	Oh, I see. Professor Gaddie. Okay.	18	Q	Can you identify that document?
19	Q	Mr. Troupis, have you seen Exhibit No. 69 before?	19	A	It's an e-mail from me to Tad and Adam regarding
	-	I don't recall it but apparently I did because	20		scheduling a meeting with the leadership in early
20	Α				June of 2011.
20 21	A	it's directed to me.	21		ounc or zorr.
	A Q		21 22	Q	Right, and it's dated June 3rd; correct?
21		it's directed to me. You'll see in the subject line well, actually let me take a step back. This is an e-mail from		Q A	
21 22		You'll see in the subject line well, actually	22		Right, and it's dated June 3rd; correct?
21 22 23	Q	You'll see in the subject line well, actually let me take a step back. This is an e-mail from	22 23		Right, and it's dated June 3rd; correct? Right. These are some of the meetings I think I

		Page 194			Page 196
1		and Mr. Foltz whether Monday meetings are on with	1		Districts 8 and 9 in Milwaukee?
2		the leadership to address Milwaukee. Do you see	2	A	I think I reflected a little bit earlier that
3		that?	3		we we had been making contacts with national
4	A	Yes, I see that's what I said.	4		the national MALDEF organization and I don't know
5	Q	And again leadership, you're referring there to	5		the timing of that. As I recall, I had contacted
6		presumably the leadership of the senate and	6		Nina Perales before this and I don't know whether
7		assembly?	7		I had made contact with Elisa Alfonso at that
8	A	Correct, the people I identified before. The	8		point. I don't remember. There would be a time
9		senate and assembly.	9		being issue, so I don't recall.
10	Q	Senate and assembly. When you identify or you use	10	Q	Do you know whether the Monday meetings that
11		the phrase there to address Milwaukee, do you see	11		you're referring to in this e-mail resulted in a
12		that?	12		final decision about the orientation and makeup of
13	A	Yes, I do.	13		Districts 8 and 9?
14	Q	What are you referring to?	14	A	I am sure that it did not result in a final
15	A	I mentioned a minute ago that we had regional	15		determination.
16		areas. You remember I just said that and that's	16	Q	Do you recall whether there were various options
17		the way that you approach it. When you're doing a	17		that were presented at the Monday meetings
18		state the size of Wisconsin, you have to do it	18		referred in here for the makeup of
19		on you don't want to look at the whole map.	19		Districts 8 and 9?
20		You're going to look at the regional areas and it	20	A	I don't recall but it would have been a process,
21		would have made sense. I assume this is the first	21		so it would not surprise me if, in fact, there
22		day of meetings because everything in Wisconsin	22		were a number of options presented.
23		begins with Milwaukee. I mean, that's the way you	23	Q	Were you present at a meeting where a final option
24		draw a map and that's that would be the first	24		for Districts 8 and 9 was chosen to be presented
25		one.	25		to the legislature?
		Page 195			Page 197
1	Q	Do you recall those meetings with the leadership	1	A	Again, you make it sound very black and white.
2		to address Milwaukee in June?	2		I don't know that there ever was a final option.
3	A	I recall having those meetings and yes.			
4	Q		3		
		Were there any specific topics that were addressed	4		There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public
5	•	Were there any specific topics that were addressed when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee			There were three different proposals with regard
5 6	•		4		There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public
	A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee	4 5	Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was
6		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region?	4 5 6	Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the
6 7		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have	4 5 6 7	Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option.
6 7 8		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the	4 5 6 7 8	Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made
6 7 8 9		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why	4 5 6 7 8 9		There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that
6 7 8 9 10		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes.
6 7 8 9 10 11		when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А Q А Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A Q Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection except to say that of course I assume we would	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А Q A Q A	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one person was involved.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection except to say that of course I assume we would have and we would have addressed them at that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q Q	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one person was involved. That would have been the group at the regional
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А Q Q A Q A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection except to say that of course I assume we would have and we would have addressed them at that point.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А Q А Q А Q А	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one person was involved. That would have been the group at the regional meetings that you're talking about?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q Q	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection except to say that of course I assume we would have and we would have addressed them at that point. Do you recall specifically the any discussions	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	А Q A Q A	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one person was involved. That would have been the group at the regional meetings that you're talking about? No, no. It would have been at this point in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А Q Q A Q A	when you were looking at the region, the Milwaukee region? Well, I suspect that but I we had to have discussed the legal issues surrounding the Milwaukee legislative districts because that's why you start with Milwaukee, because it's the only substantial area of the state where there's substantial minority populations. And so you would have been discussing voting rights act types of issues? I would assume so, yes. That would have been both in the African-American and Latino districts as well? Again, I assume that. But as I sit here today, I don't have if you have some document perhaps but I don't have an independent recollection except to say that of course I assume we would have and we would have addressed them at that point.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А Q А Q А Q А	There were three different proposals with regard to the Latino community presented at a public hearing. So, you know, even then I there was no final option. In terms of those proposals that were made at the public hearing, there had to be a decision made that Yes. those would be correct, the options that would be presented; correct? Yes. Who was it that made the decision that those would be the options presented? Do you mean the decision to present those three? Correct. The group. I don't think there was any one individual involved. There are three options. I don't think there was one person involved, one person was involved. That would have been the group at the regional meetings that you're talking about?

		Page 198			Page 200
1		don't get your times confused here. In early	1	Q	If anything, it should settle a question.
2		June, this is the first time there's any	2	A	Oh, okay.
3		presentation of maps at all. So until then my	3	Q	I've handed you
4		recollection is Joe and Tad and Adam, there had	4	A	This one's okay to look at; right? I don't
5		been a series of meetings with legislators. They	5		remember this one.
6		had gone through a process to get to these	6		MR. EARLE: If you have a travel
7		regional proposals that I just mentioned, and so	7		company, it's a communication from a travel
8		that they could then, after meeting with leaders	8		company. I don't know how it could be privileged.
9		early in June, address concerns that anybody on	9		MR. POLAND: Well, it's actually
10		the leadership would have about that.	10	В	MR. POLAND:
11		So the leadership was the only people	11	Q	Mr. Troupis, I've handed you a document that
12		that only people who would have access to the	12		previously was marked as Exhibit 139. I'll give
13		entire map. So they now knew how, as I said, that	13		you a minute to look at it. And I really only
14		ripple effect, all of those different effects	14		intend to ask you about what's on the first page
15		could be, and so they would have had questions or	15		and it's simply to fix time.
16		concerns or about various things in those maps.	16	A	Let me go ahead and look at this.
17		And then and then during June they,	17	Q	Yes, please go ahead.
18		Tad and Adam and Joe would go back and they would	18	A	Okay.
19		attempt to address those concerns and blend it	19	Q	Mr. Troupis, can you identify Exhibit 139, please?
20		into a statewide map, which, as I said, there's an	20	A	Well, it's a sequence of e-mails from me or my
21		infinite number of possibilities.	21		daughter, Sarah, who is also one of the partners
22		During that same time period we were	22		in my law firm, to Professor Grofman.
23		consulting with, as I said, national Latino or	23	Q	And I really only want to focus on the very first
24		MALDEF and that's what I was doing I don't	24		page. You see that, looking at this second e-mail
25		know, other people may have been doing different	25		down, which appears to be dated around July 7,
		Page 199			Page 201
1		things in order to consider options that would	1		2011. I think it's the same e-mail chain. It's a
2		be legally acceptable, and so that's what we were	2		little bit difficult to tell exactly, but I'm
3		doing.	3		focusing on the portion of the document that says:
4		So that's the long answer to say even	4		My father, Jim Troupis, ask that I forward you
5		as we got it wouldn't have been until the end	5		these maps while he is away for the next few days.
6		of June or early July that you would have started	6		If this is not the information you were expecting,
7		to see configurations that you could safely say,	7		please let me know and I will see about getting
8		I think this is pretty well done. I that would	8		you what are you looking for. Thanks. Do you see
9		be my take.	9		that?
10	Q	In your answer, Mr. Troupis, you referred to	10	A	Yes, I do.
11		leadership having access to the entire map?	11	Q	Do you recall asking Sarah to send or forward maps
12	A	I believe they are the only ones that had access	12		to Dr. Grofman?
13		to the entire map.	13	A	Yes, I do.
14	Q	When you saw leadership, are your referring to the	14	Q	Why were you asking maps to be sent to Dr. Grofman
15		majority leadership?	15		on or round July 7, 2011?
16	A	Yes, Scott, Jeff, the speaker, the majority	16	A	I was interested in his opinion about them.
17		leader. I think I would add Senator Zipperer and	17	Q	What maps were being sent?
18		Robin Vos to that list, maybe Representative	18	A	I assume these are the maps from the Milwaukee
19	_	Suder. I don't remember.	19		area.
20	Q	It would not have included members of the minority	20	Q	And I know we're having a hard time fixing dates.
21	_	party at that point in time; correct?	21		Unfortunately there's a document on the list.
22	A	That's correct.	22		I can't ask you about it. It would help us to fix
23	Q	I think we're finally going to get to your answer	23		date but we'll just have to
24	_	on Dr. Grofman.	24	A	Well, it says July 7, so that's about right.
25	A	Oh, good. Bernie would be happy.	25	Q	Do you recall, was it was it before or after

	Page 202			Page 204
1	the strike that question. Do you recall when	1		or anything like that, but I respected his opinion
2	you first spoke with Dr. Grofman about looking at	2		and I think he respects mine. So at this point in
3	maps pertaining to Act 43 or Act 44?	3		time I was I was going to use him as a sounding
4	A It would have been	4		board.
5	MR. HODAN: I would ask the counsel	5	BY	MR. POLAND:
6	not to speculate.	6	O	But you were seeking his input?
7	THE WITNESS: I don't know that we	7	A	But you made it sound like and I just don't
8	ever spoke. These e-mails suggest that we	8		want you to misunderstand, I had not been retained
9	exchanged phone calls and I think that's probably	9		at this point in time and I doubt there was any
10	right because he was in Paris and so I don't	10		even question about retention at this point in
11	know I told you before the whole thing with	11		time, so it never happened.
12	Professor Grofman was a little embarrassing for me	12	Q	And that's essentially what I'm getting to was
13	because I wasn't able to reach him and I wasn't	13		whether there was ever any formal retention for
14	able to get ahold of him, and my very good friend,	14		the purpose of the redistricting.
15	Irwin Chemerinsky, who's the dean of the law	15	A	No. Well, I I have heard now that he is a
16	school at Irvine is I hadn't seen him in a	16		witness in these proceedings and I can see that
17	while and I was interested to hear if Professor	17		because you've got Grofman here, so so
18	Grofman had gotten to Irwin. So the two of us	18		presumably you know, he's participating.
19	were in part it was a very personal thing to me	19	Q	Yes. Just to distinguish between his role as a
20	as well as a professional matter.	20		testifying expert in the litigation and a
21	MR. EARLE: So you were obviously	21		consulting expert as part of the redistricting
22	influenced by Irwin.	22		process. That's the distinction I'm trying to
23	THE WITNESS: Obviously, obviously.	23		drawing.
24	MR. POLAND: This is still my	24	A	Oh, sure, and at this point I don't even know.
25	examination, Mr. Earle. Levity again.	25		Did he ever express any he asked about the
	Page 203			Page 205
1	THE WITNESS: But we can talk about	1		number of districts. He's very familiar with
2	Irwin, yes, if we'd like.	2		Milwaukee, I think. You know, that would have
3	MR. DAUGHTERY: Let's go off the	4		
		3		heen the sum total of what might have occurred.
4	_	3 4		been the sum total of what might have occurred. It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal.
4 5	record for that. BY MR. POLAND:	4	0	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal.
5	record for that. BY MR. POLAND:	4 5	Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on
5 6	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had	4 5		It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent?
5	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially	4 5 1 6	Q A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have.
5 6 7	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type	4 5 16 7		It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent?
5 6 7 8	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially	4 5 1 6 7 8		It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after
5 6 7 8 9	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process?	4 5 d 6 7 8		It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit
5 6 7 8 9 10	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and	4 5 d 6 7 8 9	A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered.	4 5 16 7 8 9 10	A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you	4 5 d 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you have communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been,	4 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and	4 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a friend and I've always enjoyed his company.	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall. MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and mark
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a friend and I've always enjoyed his company. So, you know, in this instance,	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A Q	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall. MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and mark this.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a friend and I've always enjoyed his company. So, you know, in this instance, I didn't you've made it sound so formal and I	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А Q A Q A A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall. MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and mark this. (Exhibit No. 232 was marked for
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a friend and I've always enjoyed his company. So, you know, in this instance, I didn't you've made it sound so formal and I think that would be incorrect. I think at this	4 5 1 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А Q A Q A A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall. MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and mark this. (Exhibit No. 232 was marked for identification.)
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	record for that. BY MR. POLAND: Q Mr. Troupis, do you know whether by July 7 you had communicated with Dr. Grofman about potentially serving as a consultant or an expert of some type as part of the redistricting process? MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't you have to remember the difference in relationships here. I've known Professor Grofman since probably the late 1980's. He had been involved in two prior redistricting efforts here. He had been, you know he's internationally renowned and whether he says of me or not, I consider him a friend and I've always enjoyed his company. So, you know, in this instance, I didn't you've made it sound so formal and I think that would be incorrect. I think at this point in time I was more likely using him as a	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A	It wasn't formal. It certainly wasn't formal. Did you ever get any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps that were sent? I don't recall getting any but I might have. I just don't recall. The maps were shortly after that, yeah, I don't recall. I'm trying to sit here and think. I don't remember. And I note it's July 7th and the public hearing was shortly after that. Correct. Just the next week. Do you recall whether receiving any feedback from Dr. Grofman on the maps before the July 13 hearing? I don't recall any if I did. It may perhaps there's an e-mail or something but I don't recall. MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and mark this. (Exhibit No. 232 was marked for identification.) MR. POLAND:

İ		Page 206			Page 208
1		chain of e-mails or a number of different e-mails.	1		June among the leadership which I described a
2		I only have questions on two specifically. I will	2		minute ago as the regional meetings to go over it
3		tell you just on numbers 41 and 49. Of course	3		where they would see sort of the sum total
4		you're free to look at as many as you want to.	4		product, and then after that you would now have to
5	A	Okay. I think I know what this is.	5		deal with, okay, we've seen it all, we've got it
6	O	Mr. Troupis, I'd like to direct your attention to	6		all here, and presumably at this point you would
7		two of the specific e-mails in this chain. To the	7		have some members that you needed to go and talk
8		extent that you need to refer to others, of course	8		to because there would be changes that are
9		you may. Number I'm sorry. I think I said 41	9		occurring during the June period, and I reflected
10		before. I should have said 46, it looks like the	10		on some of those changes that were going on in
11		writing is a little bit hard to distinguish. This	11		Milwaukee earlier with Peter. You know, that this
12		is the last e-mail on the second page.	12		is a this is a time period when there's changes
13	A	This is the one from Eric to me.	13		going on.
14	Q	This is the one from Eric on Friday, June 24th at	14	Q	And if we flip back, as a matter of fact, just two
15		4:03 p.m.	15		pages in the document to e-mail number 49?
16	A	Okay.	16	A	Oh, okay, sure.
17	Q	Mr. McLeod is stating to you: I think all the	17	Q	Does that essentially reflect
18		members are very happy with their new districts	18	A	That certainly reflects what I just said, doesn't
19		based on Tad's and Adam's reports to date. Do you	19		it, I think?
20		see that?	20	Q	Mr. Ottman is taking is there we have a few
21	A	Yes, I do.	21		unhappy members?
22	Q	Do you know what the reports are that Mr. McLeod	22	A	Yes.
23		is talking about there?	23	Q	Do you recall Mr. Ottman expressing that to you?
24	A	No.	24	A	No, I don't.
25	Q	Did you ever have a discussion with Mr. McLeod	25	Q	Mr. Ottman goes on in that e-mail to say the only
		D 007			
		Page 207			Page 209
1 1			1		· ·
1 2		about any of the members' reactions to new	1 2		problem with this draft is that they included the
1 2 3	A		1 2 3		problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward
2	A	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about	2		problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part
2	A	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is	2		problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward
2 3 4	A Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about	2 3 4	A	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with
2 3 4 5		about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that.	2 3 4 5	A Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6		about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the	2 3 4 5 6		problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7		about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their	2 3 4 5 6 7		problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time period that would involve first gathering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of legislation. He spends his entire legal career
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time period that would involve first gathering information from the members as to what was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of legislation. He spends his entire legal career doing it. And so Ray's role here was this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time period that would involve first gathering information from the members as to what was important to them and then subsequently building	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of legislation. He spends his entire legal career doing it. And so Ray's role here was this is what this is talking about, is he needed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time period that would involve first gathering information from the members as to what was important to them and then subsequently building maps for the whole state to try as best they could to take that information that they had gotten into account.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of legislation. He spends his entire legal career doing it. And so Ray's role here was this is what this is talking about, is he needed to address the drafting of the language, vis-a-vis the ward boundaries and the like, that were going to be altering the prior structure of the process.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	about any of the members' reactions to new districts? No. This would have been all that I recall about that. I'm pointing to number 46. His comment is all I remember hearing from him about that. Did you speak with Mr. McLeod at all about the process where members were able to see what their new districts looked like? I don't recall any discussions about that. Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Ottman or Mr. Foltz? No, I don't recall any specific discussions about that. Generally do you recall any discussions? Yes. What do you recall generally? Well, what I described earlier, which is the series of meetings that would go on over a time period that would involve first gathering information from the members as to what was important to them and then subsequently building maps for the whole state to try as best they could to take that information that they had gotten into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q Q	problem with this draft is that they included the language on municipalities redrawing their ward boundaries in this legislation rather than in part of the separate legislation that also deals with venue changes. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Do you recall discussing that topic at all with Mr. Ottman or anyone else? Well, the or anyone else, yes, I certainly do recall that discussion. Who did you discuss that with? Well, that would be with Ray Taffora primarily. Why would that have been a problem? Well, it's only a problem in the sense of the drafting and nature of drafting language. I'm not a legislative expert when it comes to drafting legislation but Ray Taffora is probably the single expert in the state of Wisconsin on drafting of legislation. He spends his entire legal career doing it. And so Ray's role here was this is what this is talking about, is he needed to address the drafting of the language, vis-a-vis the ward boundaries and the like, that were going

		Page 210			Page 212
1		drafting issue. So I that's what that is.	1	Q	Were you part of the discussion of whether the
2	Q	Did you have any discussions with Mr. Taffora	2	·	census blocks or census tracts should be used to
3		about drafting the language relating to ward	3		create assembly districts?
4		boundaries?	4	A	You know, that's a level of detail I just don't
5	A	Oh, yeah, I'm sure I did.	5		remember.
6	Q	Were there any issues that had arisen as to ward	6		MR. POLAND: Why don't we go off the
7	•	boundaries with the legislation that you're aware	7		record.
8		of?	8		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
9	A	Yes.	9		the record at 9:06 p.m.
10	Q	What were those issues?	10		(A recess was taken.)
11	A	Well, I can't delineate precisely what the ward	11		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
12		boundary issues were but the there was a lot of	12		record at 9:20 p.m.
13		misunderstanding about the process by which these	13		EXAMINATION
14		districts would be completed, and that	14	ВҮ	MR. HODAN:
15		misunderstanding continued right through the	15	Q	Good evening, Mr. Troupis.
16		hearing on July 13, with regard to whether ward	16	A	Good evening.
17		boundaries that had already been settled upon by	17	Q	I represent the Government Accountability Board
18		local communities and the like would have to be	18		members in their individual capacity and I have
19		maintained or not and what's the sequence of these	19		some follow-up questions. You were asked the
20		things.	20		questions about District 8 and District 9. Those
21		So when you were changing, because of	21		are the Hispanic districts.
22		the nature of this particular legislation, the	22	A	Yes.
23		ward boundary issue had arisen. So that's what	23	Q	In this case there's an allegation that the maps
24		all this is referring to. And again, I was and	24		and the map drawers in particular tried to
25		remain very deferential to another member of the	25		intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic
		Page 211			Page 213
1		team in this case, Mr. Taffora, who is a drafting	1		community in those districts. Was that your
2		expert.	2		intent and your role as counsel?
3	Q	Mr. Troupis, is it your understanding that in	3	A	Absolutely not.
4		previous redistricting efforts municipalities had	4	Q	And what was your intent and what was the group's
5		completed their ward process before the time that	5		intent in drawing Districts 8 and 9?
6		maps were created and the districts were created?	6	A	Generally in District 8 and 9
7	A	Yes, and the other party had been attempting to	7		MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the
8		change that for quite some time, and the	8		form.
9		Republicans were adopting that as one of the	9		THE WITNESS: In District 8 and 9
10		proposals here, that it ought to start at the	10		you're dealing with
11		state level and go to the local level rather than	11		MR. HODAN: What's the
12		the reverse. So this was this has been	12		MR. EARLE: It's compound. He asked
13		something that people have talked about for a long	13		for the intent of two different entities, him and
14	0	time on both sides of the aisle.	14		the group, and as to the group I object on the
15	Q	And is it your understanding that in the 2011	15	DV	grounds of foundation.
16		redistricting, rather than waiting for the	16		MR. HODAN:
17		municipalities to finish their process of creating	17	Q	Do you have an understanding as to how District 8
18		wards, census blocks were used to create assembly	18		was drawn?
19	A	district boundaries?	19	A	Yes. Do you have an understanding as to have District 0
20	A	I don't know the latter part about census blocks	20	Q	Do you have an understanding as to how District 9
01		and the like because I wasn't involved in the actual construction of these things, but the	21 22	A	was drawn? Yes, I do.
21		actual construction of these things, but the	44		•
22		the process of word houndaries was shaped and have	23	()	And X and U are adjoining districts, correct?
22 23		the process of ward boundaries was changed and how	23	Q A	And 8 and 9 are adjoining districts; correct?
22		the process of ward boundaries was changed and how those were adopted within the context of the state legislative map.	23 24 25	Q A Q	That's correct. And there's a line between 8 and 9; correct?

Page 214 Page 216 Well, yes, technically, of course. district, that we would make that happen. And so Α 1 1 2 Q So if you reconfigure that line, you affect 2 we -- we configured this in very significant 3 3 either -- you affect both 8 and 9; correct? measure to make sure that if it was possible, you 4 Α Yes, as a practical matter, of course. 4 could have two representatives from that community 5 0 So with that background, can you tell me what the 5 in the state legislature if they so chose. 6 intent was in drawing Districts 8 and 9? 6 We also thought that there would be an 7 7 MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the opportunity for a senate district over time and 8 question on two grounds. Foundation. I think he 8 again that's a trending question. We certainly 9 9 testified that he didn't remember the actual had what would be called an influence district 10 designation of the lines. So --10 there because you had two assembly districts. So 11 MR. HODAN: You can go ahead and 11 we then -- we certainly wanted to focus on the 12 12 growth in the third assembly district and then the answer. 13 MR. POLAND: Join in the objection to 13 senate district would encompass what we would hope 14 form as well. 14 would be eventually a majority/minority district 15 THE WITNESS: Okay. Whenever we would 15 for the state senate as well. So we were 16 look at -- whenever I would like at from a legal 16 conscious of trends, movements and we hoped that 17 perspective the map of a minority district, a 17 in that process we could accomplish that goal as 18 district in which there's a minority population, 18 well on the south side of Milwaukee. 19 in this case the Latino population, you're going 19 We -- I reflected a minute ago that my 20 to be very conscious of a number of things, and 20 perspective, the legal perspective was to make 21 21 it's not an exhaustive list but we were certainly sure that we complied with all of the rules and 22 very conscious of a number of things. 22 regulations as we understood them for creating 23 Number one was that the prior court in 23 these minority districts. 24 2002 had drawn a minority/majority district for 24 MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the 25 25 the Latino community of approximately 58 percent answer as nonresponsive, a long, winding, Page 217 Page 215 voting age population, and that seat had been held meandering narrative and move to strike. 1 1 2 throughout the decade with, as I recall, Pedro BY MR. HODAN: 3 3 How did the old District 8 compare to the new Colon and then JoCasta now. And so we wanted 4 to -- we certainly wanted to make sure that you 4 District 8 in terms of voting age population, if 5 would not retrograde, you would not go back. So 5 you recall? 6 you had a minority/majority district. You want to 6 Α Slightly larger. 7 7 make sure that you don't do something to undo that And did you view that as an improvement to the 8 district. 8 district or a detriment to the Hispanic community? 9 9 Α I certainly thought it was an improvement. Again, The second thing that we want to make 10 sure in any minority situation, and it would not 10 it could have been -- it was within the range that 11 be strictly in the Latino community, is that you 11 you'd expect. 12 give the community an opportunity to elect a 12 Q And do you recall how old District 9 compared to 13 13 new District 9 with respect to voting age representative of their choice. We didn't do a 14 precise Jingles analysis because it wasn't 14 population? 15 15 **A** A dramatic increase. necessarily. Again, it was already in place, a 16 Latino representative. We knew that the community 16 And did you view that as an improvement to the 17 was growing. 17 district? 18 I think I reflected a little bit 18 **A** Very much so. 19 19 O Do you recall in District 9 whether that seat was earlier in other testimony that we were very 20 conscious of the fact this community was large, it 20 now an open seat? 21 21 **A** was growing, it was likely to continue to grow. You were mentioning a bit ago about various 22 And so we wanted to make sure that not only would 22 factors that you take into account, and I think my 23 the original district remain able to elect a 23 prior testimony I was also talking about that. It 24 representative of choice of that community but 24 was -- it would be an open seat in the new 25 25 that also, if it was possible to create a second configuration.

		Page 218			Page 220
1	Q	And why was that significant?	1		MR. HODAN: It's JRT123.
2	A	Well, particularly in a new district, the district	2		MR. EARLE: Why don't we
3		that is now newly minority/majority, it would give	3		THE WITNESS: Why don't we get that
4		at the earliest possible time that community an	4		out of the folder there.
5		opportunity to elect a representative of their	5		MR. HODAN: I don't need one while the
6		choice.	6		witness has it.
7		If you have there's an incumbent	7		MR. EARLE: But, you know, what about
8		benefit that that you have. So that if you	8		the other exhibits you have. So we'll get them
9		have a nonminority representative and was sitting	9		done.
10		now in the new minority/majority district, it	10		MR. HODAN: Great.
11		might well there is a factor that has to be	11		THE WITNESS: Make copies.
12		taken into account. This avoided that potential	12		MR. EARLE: This is going
13		pitfall.	13		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: You want to go off?
14	Q	So is it fair to say that in your view Districts 8	14		THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	•	and District 9 were improvements over the	15		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
16		Court-drawn plan?	16		record at 9:31 p.m.
17	A	They certainly were.	17		(Discussion off the record.)
18	Q	Did you share that opinion with	18		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
19		MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the	19		record at 9:38 p.m.
20		last question as leading.	20		MR. HODAN: Could you plead read back
21	ВҮ	MR. HODAN:	21		the last question?
22	O	How did you feel about the difference between old	22		(The record was read as follows:
23		District 8 and new Districts 8 and 9?	23		"I'm going to show you what's been
24	A	Well, we were we went to great lengths, at	24		marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You
25		least I thought we did, to ensure that we made a	25		can look at it.")
					,
		Page 219			Page 221
1		$\label{eq:page-219} \mbox{Page 219}$ significant improvement in those two districts, 8,	1	ву	Page 221 MR. HODAN:
1 2		•	1 2	BY Q	
		significant improvement in those two districts, 8,			MR. HODAN:
2	Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by	2		MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as
2 3	Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly.	2		MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to
2 3 4	Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9	2 3 4		MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears
2 3 4 5		significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others?	2 3 4 5	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct?
2 3 4 5 6	A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did.	2 3 4 5 6	Q A	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Q	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q BY Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying to make sure it's not on my list here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: I said I believe this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying to make sure it's not on my list here. MR. HODAN: It's not on your list.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: I said I believe this is the information I also just referred to. We've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying to make sure it's not on my list here. MR. HODAN: It's not on your list. MR. EARLE: Why don't we do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: I said I believe this is the information I also just referred to. We've had some good articles come out about the Hispanic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying to make sure it's not on my list here. MR. HODAN: It's not on your list. MR. EARLE: Why don't we do that. I need to get a copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: I said I believe this is the information I also just referred to. We've had some good articles come out about the Hispanic districts, pointing out that the percent that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A	significant improvement in those two districts, 8, 9, and then potentially the senate district by consulting with MALDEF directly. Did you share your view about Districts 8 and 9 with others? Yes, I did. Did you share and who did you share those views with? Well, primarily from my perspective I shared them with the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, which is MALDEF. I've been referring to it by the acronym. And we shared with them all the information that we could that they asked for. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. I don't have a copy. You can look at it. MR. DAUGHTERY: Is that one of the ones that you had Bate stamped? I'm just trying to make sure it's not on my list here. MR. HODAN: It's not on your list. MR. EARLE: Why don't we do that. I need to get a copy. MR. HODAN: Actually you have a copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis, I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 1168. And I direct your attention to the to the middle of the document that appears to be an e-mail from you to Mr. McLeod; correct? Yes. Ottman, Taffora? The one dated July 26th. July 26th at 11:30 a.m.; is that correct? Yes. Could you read that into the record, please? MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. HODAN: This is an e-mail from you? Yes, it is. And what did you say in this e-mail? MR. POLAND: Object to the form. THE WITNESS: I said I believe this is the information I also just referred to. We've had some good articles come out about the Hispanic districts, pointing out that the percent that elected Hispanic reps rep in the past was lower

		Page 222			Page 224
1		numbers demonstrate without comment how good this	s 1		and it's truly infinite. You can draw lines any
2		is to for minority populations. No one should	2		number of ways. When we look to experts here
3		comment, just provide the numbers. Jim.	3		traditionally we're looking at experts to make
4	BY	MR. HODAN:	4		sure that we comply with federal laws, the Voting
5	0	That first sentence where you said I believe that	5		Rights Act or otherwise and the districting laws
6	4	is the information I also just referred to, do you	6		in a statistical analysis. I'm not imposing my
7		know what you were talking about?	7		views or anybody else's views but you look at it
8	A	I assume it's the information about the specific	8		from a statistical perspective to make sure that
9		legislative districts and the minority populations	9		you are, in fact, achieving what you believe
10		in those districts, I assume.	10		you're achieving, compliance with those laws.
11		MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the	11	Q	Now, you were involved in the redistricting in the
12		question and move to strike. Speculation.	12	-	1990's; is that correct?
13	BY	MR. HODAN:	13	A	Yes, I was.
14	Q	The second sentence when you said we've had some	14	Q	Were experts retained in connection with that
15		good articles come out about the Hispanic	15		litigation?
16		districts pointing out the percentage of elected	16	A	Yes.
17		Hispanic reps in the past was lower than ours and	17	Q	Were experts, if you know, obtained prior to
18		it is a nice contrast, that's the reason I like to	18		litigation?
19		add what the prior map had, what are you referring	19	A	Yes.
20		to there?	20	Q	Do you know, did the Democrats retain experts in
21	A	Just what I'm saying, it's that we, during the	21		the 1990's?
22		course of the hearings which had taken place just	22	A	Yes, certainly they did.
23		prior to this, there had been information	23	Q	And you were involved in the 2000 redistricting;
24		provided, quite explicit information about the	24		is that right?
25		populations of all the districts, including	25	A	Yes, I was.
		Page 223			Page 225
					•
1		information about the minority populations in	1		MR. EARLE: Wait. On the question
2		those district. This particular e-mail is	2		about the Democrats I'm going to object on the
3		referring to those numbers relative to the	3	DV	grounds of foundation.
4	0	Hispanic or Latino Districts 8 and 9. And the last sentence in that e-mail where it	4 5		MR. HODAN:
5 6	Q	reads the numbers demonstrate without comment how		Q	Are you aware of the what particular experts would have been retained by any of the Democrats
7		good this is for minority populations pardon	7		in the 1990's?
8		me. The second last sentence, it reads the	8	A	Yes.
9		numbers demonstrate without comment how good this	_	Q	And who were some of those experts, if you recall?
10		is for the minority populations, what point were	10	A	Was I I said yes but you saw I hesitated
11		you trying to make there?	11		because my memory may not be as good as it once
12	A	That we had with this redistricting improved	12		was.
13		dramatically the opportunity of a Latino	13		MR. EARLE: Move to strike the former
14		population in Milwaukee to elect representatives	14		testimony.
15		of their choice.	15		THE WITNESS: No. I mean, like I
16	Q	And the last sentence reads no one should comment,	16		said, I know that they had experts. I'm just not
17		just provide the numbers. What did you mean	17		100 percent sure of the names because the the
18		there?	18		record will reflect what it was in those federal
19	A	That's a the numbers speak for themselves.	19		proceedings.
20	Q	Now, you were asked some questions about seeking	20	BY	MR. HODAN:
1		the assistance of experts in the redistricting	21	Q	So, for example, if we were to look at
21			22		Mr. Grofman's declaration from 1992, we might be
21 22		process. Why were you looking for assistance from			
		process. Why were you looking for assistance from experts?	23		able to discern what experts were there?
22	A				able to discern what experts were there? MR. EARLE: I'm going to object.
22 23	A	experts?	23		

		Page 226			Page 228
1		THE WITNESS: In the next I can	1	BY	MR. HODAN:
2		explain how it would work.	2	Q	Did any of the Democrats ever attempt to share a
3		MR. EARLE: You're asking him to	3		map with you or your group?
4		speculate as to what in Mr. Grofman's report.	4	A	No.
5		THE WITNESS: I wouldn't be	5		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
6		speculating about what's in Mr. Grofman's report.	6		question, foundation.
7		It would be there because of the way in which the	7		THE WITNESS: No.
8		evidence went in.	8		MR. HODAN: Foundation as to whether
9	BY	MR. HODAN:	9		he ever received a map from the Democrats?
10	Q	And how did the evidence go in?	10		MR. POLAND: That wasn't your
11	A	We had direct testimony went in by way of	11		question.
12		declarations and affidavits and there was only	12	BY	MR. HODAN:
13		cross-examination.	13	Q	Did you ever receive a map from the Democrats?
14	Q	And are you familiar with a gentleman by the name	14	A	No.
15		of Joel Gratz?	15	Q	They didn't share one with you?
16	A	Yes.	16	A	No, they did not.
17	Q	Okay. And do you recall what role he had in 2002?	17	Q	Were they secretive about it?
18		MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	18		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
19		THE WITNESS: One of the people	19		question. Foundation.
20		involved on the other side of the case.	20		THE WITNESS: I wouldn't necessarily
21	BY	MR. HODAN:	21		use secretive. It's a part of the redistricting
22	Q	Do you know, did he have any involvement in	22		process that's been common for years.
23		drawing maps for the Democrats in 2002?	23	BY	MR. HODAN:
24	A	That my recollection is that he was one of the	24	Q	And you've been part of that process for the last
25		people that actually drafted those maps in that	25		30 years. During that last 30 years, do you ever
		Page 227			Page 229
1		time period.	1		recall a situation where the Democrats shared a
2	Q	Throughout this process, there has been a	2		map with you prior to offering it to Court or to
3		suggestion that there's been this grand	3		the public?
4		conspiracy, everything is secretive. During this	4		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
5		process you indicated that each of the caucuses	5		question.
6		received terminals; is that right?	6		MR. EARLE: Join.
7	A	Yes.	7		THE WITNESS: I do not recall that
8		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the	8		ever happening.
9		question.	9		MR. HODAN:
10		MR. EARLE: Join.	10	Q	And you would have known that as lead counsel in
11		MR. HODAN:	11		both those cases; correct?
12	Q	Are you aware?	12		MR. EARLE: Object to the form.
13	A	Yes, I am aware.	13		MR. POLAND: Objection, leading.
14	Q	Okay. And do you recall what type of terminal	14	D17 1	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15		that would be?	15		MR. HODAN:
16	A	I wouldn't know the precise terminal but we	16	Q	Would you have known that?
17		participated in the negotiation of those	17	A	Yes. There is in this suggestion that somehow it was
18 19	0	arrangements in the year before the 2011 cycle.	18	Q	There is in this suggestion that somehow it was improper and secretive that the terminal to draw
20	Q	And was each caucus then able to use a terminal to	19 20		• •
20	A	draw a map?	20		maps was moved over to Michael Best. Why was the terminal moved over to Michael Best?
22	A	Absolutely. MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the	21		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
44		question, foundation.	23		question.
03		question, roundation.	23		question.
23 24		THE WITNESS: Yes	24		MR EARLE: Object to the form Join
24		THE WITNESS: Yes.	24 25		MR. EARLE: Object to the form. Join. THE WITNESS: Well as I think I said
		THE WITNESS: Yes.	24 25		MR. EARLE: Object to the form. Join. THE WITNESS: Well, as I think I said

1	Page 230			Page 232
1	earlier, it's a matter of efficiency above all	1	A	Yes, I was.
2	else. It's simply easier and more efficient to	2	Q	And were you present for the entire testimony?
3	have them in this case in a separate facility than	3	A	Yes, I was.
4	it would be to have them somewhere in the Capitol.	4		MR. HODAN: I have one copy. I assume
5	That's just the way it would work in a particular	5		you have a copy.
6	office.	6		MR. POLAND: We've got a bunch right
7	BY MR. HODAN:	7		here copied.
8	Q Is it more convenient for the lawyers?	8		MR. HODAN: Great. Why don't we pass
9	MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	9		them out.
10	MR. EARLE: Join in the objection to	10		MR. POLAND: Did you want me to hand
11	the question as well.	11		it to the witness?
12	THE WITNESS: When I said efficient,	12		MR. HODAN: Please.
13	that's part of the process. The legal part of	13		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
14	this process, as I think I explained earlier, is a	14	BY	MR. HODAN:
15	very important part of it, and working with the	15	Q	Mr. Troupis, before you is Exhibit 19, which I'll
16	lawyers is an integral part of that to comply with	16		represent to you is an official transcript of
17	the laws that we've been talking about. So the	17		those proceedings on July 13, 2011.
18	proximity is very important.	18	A	Yes.
19	BY MR. HODAN:	19	Q	Would you turn to page 133, please?
	Q All right. There's been some testimony or	20	A	Yes.
21	deposition testimony in this case, I'll represent	21	Q	Okay. Are you familiar with Representative
22	to you, that the Democrats might have sent one of	22		Zamarripa?
23	their terminals off-site. Were you aware of that?	23	A	Yes, I am. Well, I am. We don't know each other.
24	MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the	24		Probably the first time I met her was at this
25	question.	25		hearing.
	Page 231			Page 233
1	BY MR. HODAN:	1	Q	Are you aware that she is the incumbent in
2	Q You can go ahead and answer.	2		assembly district 8?
3	A I had certainly heard that.	3	A	Yes.
4	MR. POLAND: Move to strike. Hearsay.	4	Q	Are you aware that she sat on this committee?
5	MR. EARLE: Join.	5	A	Yes.
6	BY MR. HODAN:	6	Q	Could you read in the record, please, what she
7	Q Do you know, are you familiar with the entity	7		said?
8	known as the Shop Consulting?	8		MR. POLAND: Object to go ahead,
9	A I apologize. I don't.	9		finish your question.
10	Q Okay. Would you consider that somehow secretive	10	BY	MR. HODAN:
11	or nefarious or wrong if the Democrats had taken	11	Q	Could you read into the record first, you
12	one of their terminals and sent it somewhere else	12		indicated you were there. Do you recall what she
13	to be used?	13		said about her districts?
14	MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the	14		MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the
15	question.	15		you're asking him to it's hearsay at this
16	MR. EARLE: Join.	16		point. You're offering this for the truth of
	BY MR. HODAN:	17		matter asserted.
	Q You can go ahead and answer.	18		MR. HODAN: Well, it's an official
	A I would not think that. I would be surprised if	19		government record. I think there is an exception
20	the reverse were true.	20		to the hearsay rule, but
21	Q You were present during the July 13, 2011	21 22		MR. POLAND: I'm sorry. I just want
22	committee hearing?	23		to get my objection. Object to the form of the question. It's leading having the witness just
22				AND THE PROPERTY OF THE VIEW O
23	And that would have been the joint public hearing			
23	Q And that would have been the joint public hearing of the Wisconsin redistricting plan?	24 25		read in sworn testimony into the record is an improper question and it's leading.

	Page 234		Page 236
1	BY MR. HODAN:	1	does not need the assistance of a document to have
2	Q Well, let me ask you a question then. Do you	2	his refreshing his recollection refreshed. So
3	recall halfway down, and I'll read what she said	3	I'd request that you asked him the questions
4	and then you can tell me whether you remember	4	without testimony. Ask him I think you need to
5	hearing this. She said the 8th and the 9th, the	5	ask him what she testified about without use of
6	8th is my district, it is a Latino super majority	6	the document because
7	district. Do you recall her indicating that?	7	BY MR. HODAN:
8	MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	8	Q Do you recall her saying there continues to be two
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.	9	and I'm glad to hear that they're moving from a
10	BY MR. HODAN:	10	majority to a super majority in the 8th and 9th?
11	Q And she continued the 9th was trending that way.	11	A Yes.
12	It is already been a Latino influence district and	12	MR. POLAND: Object to form.
13	this does give us a larger percentage. Do you	13	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
14	recall hearing her say that?	14	BY MR. HODAN:
15	A Yes, I do.	15	Q And that was an open hearing?
16	MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	16	A Yes, it was.
17	BY MR. HODAN:	17	MR. POLAND: I move to strike the
18	Q She continued but the truth is that you know that	18	entire line of questioning. Counsel's testifying
19	the Latinos have grown by leaps and bounds here.	19	by reading sworn testimony into the record and
20	Do you recall her saying that?	20	asking the witness if he recalls hearing it.
21	A Yes, I do.	21	MR. EARLE: And I join in the motion.
22	MR. POLAND: Object to form.	22	MR. HODAN: And you agree this is
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.	23	sworn testimony?
24	BY MR. HODAN:	24	MR. POLAND: Well, that's what you
25	Q And we were trending that way anyway. Do you	25	represented it was.
	Page 235		Page 237
1		1	
1 2	recall her saying that? A Yes.	1 2	MR. HODAN: Well, I thought you just said it was sworn testimony.
3	MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	3	MR. POLAND: It's from the
4	MR. EARLE: I join in all those	4	proceedings. It appears to be. Somebody said
5	objections.	5	it's an official document.
6	BY MR. HODAN:	6	BY MR. HODAN:
7	Q And she continued, it's almost inevitable we just	7	Q When you hear the term "super majority," does that
8	grew it, it's not that you created another one.	8	concern you with respect to strike that. I'm
9	There's not three there now. Do you recall her	9	looking for 96.
10	saying that?	10	MR. POLAND: Is that one that's
11	A Yes.	11	already been marked, Patrick?
12	MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	12	MR. EARLE: 96.
13	MR. EARLE: I object to form as well.	13	MR. HODAN: 96.
14	BY MR. HODAN:	14	BY MR. HODAN:
15	Q And then she continues, there continues to be two	15	Q Mr. Troupis, before we get before we get to 96,
16	and I'm glad to hear that they're moving from a	16	I want to go back to the claim of some of the
17	majority to a super majority in the 8th and 9th.	17	plaintiffs in this case that the Act 43
18	MR. EARLE: I'm going to object.	18	intentionally discriminates against the Hispanic
19	BY MR. HODAN:	19	community. Would it have been a prudent strike
20	Q Do you recall hearing that?	20	that. Is District 8 a predominantly Democratic or
21	MR. EARLE: Let me expand on my	21	Republican district?
22	objection. For the last five in a row, the	22	A Democrat.
23	deponent has said he remembers the statements	23	Q Substantially Democratic district?
24	after you asked, you read them from the record.	24	A I would probably use the term prohibitively
25	He's now established clearly on the record that he	25	Democratic.

		Page 238			Page 240
1	Q	So the Democrats have held District 8 for a long	1	A	Certainly it would and I would never been a part
2		time?	2		to it.
3	A	Yes. Well, they don't hold the district, so to	3	Q	Now, I'd ask you to look at
4		speak, but that part of the city of Milwaukee you	4	·	MR. EARLE: You wanted 96?
5		know, has consistently voted Democrat in a variety	5	BY	MR. HODAN:
6		of different elections. We haven't had elections	6	Q	Exhibit 96, please.
7		in the new 8, so	7		MR. DAUGHTERY: He's got it.
8	Q	With respect to the allegation by the plaintiffs	8	BY	MR. HODAN:
9		that the map drawers were trying to intentionally	9	Q	You were asked some questions by I believe
10		discriminate against the Hispanic community, would	10		Attorney Earle earlier
11		that have made sense from the perspective of the	11	A	Yes.
12		Republican leadership?	12	Q	I don't know if my text is on the second and
13		MR. EARLE: I'm going to that's	13		third page on the WisPolitics. This is a press
14		leading.	14		release. Mine seems to be highlighted. Do you
15		MR. POLAND: Join in the objection and	15		see the highlighted text?
16		foundation too.	16	A	Yes, I do.
17	BY	MR. HODAN:	17	Q	Okay. And I believe the highlighted text, I want
18	Q	The question was would it have made sense?	18		to ask you about this just to see what you know.
19		MR. POLAND: Same objections.	19		The highlighted text reads finally, this appears
20		THE WITNESS: Not from the perspective	20		to be a press release from Voces de la Frontera;
21		of a legal matter from my perspective.	21		is that correct?
22	BY	MR. HODAN:	22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And why not?	23	Q	And this has to do with the city of Milwaukee
24		MR. POLAND: Same objections, object	24		redistricting?
25		to form and foundation.	25	A	That was my understanding.
		Page 239			Page 241
1		MR. EARLE: Join.	1	Q	And the highlighted section reads: Finally, in
2		THE WITNESS: Well, because the as	2		order to more effectively increase the
3		I explained a little bit earlier, the process by	3		possibilities of Latinos being elected in the
4		which these we comply with the Voting Rights	4		proposed 8th and 12th, their voting age
5		Act and draw these involve a series of steps, none	5		populations need to be increased respectively from
6		of which, all of which could be followed	6		62.3 percent in the former and 67.6 percent in the
7		without without affecting any kind of a	7		latter to at least 70 percent. This can be done
8		partisan outcome, but from my standpoint I'm	8		with minor changes as there are a number of
9		saying as a lawyer we were obligated to look at	9		adjacent boards that have majority of Hispanic
10		those matters and do the best we could in order to	10		voting age populations.
11		comply with the Voting Rights Act. No client, at	11		My question to you is do you know if
12		least from my perspective, would hire me in order	12		the city of Milwaukee when it redistricted the
13		to come up with a way of not complying with the	13		aldermanic district actually went along with what
					Voces de la Frontera asked for?
14		law. We were that was our job.	14		voces de la Fioritera asked ior?
15		MR. HODAN:	15		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
15 16	BY Q	MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to	15 16		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question.
15 16 17		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic	15		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the
15 16 17 18		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a	15 16 17 18		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well.
15 16 17 18 19		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court	15 16 17		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as
15 16 17 18 19 20		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a	15 16 17 18 19 20		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN:
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court	15 16 17 18 19	BY C	MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN: Would it surprise you to learn that the city of
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court challenge? MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to form of the question.	15 16 17 18 19 20		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN:
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court challenge? MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to	15 16 17 18 19 20 21		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN: Would it surprise you to learn that the city of
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court challenge? MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to form of the question.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN: Would it surprise you to learn that the city of Milwaukee didn't?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	MR. HODAN: And if you had done that, if you had been out to intentionally discriminate against the Hispanic community, would that have increased the odds of a court challenge being a successful court challenge? MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to form of the question. MR. POLAND: Same objection.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		MR. POLAND: Object to the form of the question. MR. EARLE: Object to the form as well. THE WITNESS: I do not know. MR. HODAN: Would it surprise you to learn that the city of Milwaukee didn't? MR. EARLE: Object to the form of the

		Page 242			Page 244
1		Č	1		
1		THE WITNESS: As I reflected	1		minority citizens being packed into an area that
2		MR. HODAN: I'll withdraw the	2		they don't that are unneeded. So that's
4	DV	question. MR. HODAN:	4		that's what I was trying to get across and that in
			5		a very classic sense this is the way much of the
5	Q	I'd like to look at the first page of Exhibit 96.	6		modern Voting Rights Act and redistricting got
6 7		You wrote here the problem here is that the group	7		started is that in large urban areas in particular
8		wants 70 percent. What you were referring to what	8		and in the South they simply packed in large
		Voces de la Frontera wanted in the aldermanic	9		numbers of minorities and thus they would lose
9		districts?			their effective representation because they could
10	A	Yes, that's exactly what I was referring to.	10		have been in two or three different districts and
11	Q	And what's the problem that you thought that	11	0	now you're locked into one.
12		created?	12	Q	You were involved in the 1990 redistricting in
13	A	The next sentence said it's classic overkill.	13 14	A	Milwaukee; correct? That's correct.
14 15	Q	And what did you mean by that?	15		
	A	It's simply not necessary for the Latino or		Q	Can you tell us what the fight was in connection
16		Hispanic community here to have that level of a	16 17		with the African-American districts that was at issue there?
17 18		percentage of voting age population in order to	17	A	
		elect a representative of their choice, and and		A	Well, my, again, my recollection is that the
19		it's a bad idea. It's a bad idea because you're	19		the districts in Milwaukee could be drawn with
20		wasting the opportunity to elect, for the	20		nearly 100 percent African-American population and
21		community to elect more representatives of choice	21		as a consequence you could have limit the
22		if you if you pack in that level of that	22		number of African-American representatives in
23		those kind of numbers. That's what I was	23 24		Milwaukee. So we spent a great deal of time and
24	0	referring to.			efforts in that litigation and the court file, you
25	Q	And I take it you were referring in the context of	25		know, shows it, that trying to make sure that you
		Page 243			Page 245
1		Districts 8 and 9 in that regard.	1		didn't pack those numbers so large that the
2	A	That's correct.	2		African-American population would end up, in
3	Q	So you didn't let me ask you. So those	3		effect, underrepresented in the city of Milwaukee.
4		comments were directed to your view about a	4	Q	So in that regard, were you successful?
5		problem that those numbers would create for	5	A	Yes.
6		District 8 and 9?	6	O	And to your knowledge did those districts perform
7		MR. POLAND: Object to the form.	7	·	as as you had predicted?
8		MR. EARLE: Yes, more than super	8	Α	Yes.
9		leading.	9		MR. EARLE: Object to the form of the
10	BY	MR. HODAN:	10		last question.
11	Q	I'm just trying to understand what	11	BY	/ MR. HODAN:
12	٠	MR. EARLE: There's not an exception	12	Q	In 2000 you were involved in the Wisconsin
13		for leading for your failing to understand.	13	-	redistricting and there was a dispute over the
14		MR. HODAN: Thank you, counsel.	14		African-American districts; correct?
15	ВУ	MR. HODAN:	15	A	Yes, there was.
16	Q	Let me rephrase. Your the problem you were	16	Q	And do you recall what that dispute was?
17		referring to had to do with those numbers in	17	A	It was essentially the same problem as we faced in
18		Districts 8 and 9.	18	-	the 1990's, that the African-American population
19	A	That's correct.	19		had grown dramatically in the districts that had
20	Q	And you continued, I'm already very worried about	20		previously been drawn by the Western District
21	•	the 65 percent. What did you mean by that?	21		federal court in the earlier cycle. So the
22	A	Well, you need to understand or appreciate, this	22		question that map drawing faced in that situation
23		is voting age population. I mean, the percentage	23		was how ought those districts be configured so as
24		of actual population is higher than this. And so	24		to maximize the opportunity for the
			25		•
25		you're talking about an enormous number of	23		African-American population to elect

Page 246 Page 248 representatives of their choice. And that meant counsel, please. I gave you an opportunity to 1 1 2 necessarily that certain districts had to be 2 make your record. 3 3 reconfigured in order to reduce that total MR. EARLE: And I'm very appreciative 4 African-American population to the best you could. 4 of that. 5 It's a very concentrated population and so in some 5 MR. HODAN: Thank you. He was not 6 respects it's rather difficult. 6 disclosed in the pretrial report by the plaintiffs 7 7 Q And were you successful in convincing the court to as a witness. It was only after the court 8 draw the number of African-American districts in 8 indicated that his deposition could be taken today 9 9 that we learned that he was going to be a witness 10 10 MR. POLAND: Object to the form. in the case and so we're entitled to ask him 11 BY MR. HODAN: 11 questions regarding his knowledge and we'll move 12 Q You can go ahead and answer. 12 13 Α 13 MR. EARLE: Well, to complete the I believe we were and I believe, but I wouldn't 14 want to be the person to say that. I think 14 record, it was disclosed at the Rule 26 disclosure 15 Professor Grofman is the one who addressed that 15 and the decision to call him as a witness was made 16 directly with the Court. 16 after review of the latest batch of previously 17 Q In both the 1990's and 2000 litigation, was there 17 undisclosed e-mails. That came from the legal 18 testimony from individual legislators in the 18 team on Friday, the 17th. 19 African-American districts saying that they needed 19 BY MR. HODAN: 20 higher percentages in order to be reelected? 20 You were asked some questions about the 21 MR. POLAND: I'm going to object to 21 configuration of Districts 8 and 9. Do you know 22 form and actually this goes way beyond the scope. 22 how the aldermanic districts in the city of 23 MR. EARLE: I move to strike the 23 Milwaukee are configured within Assembly 24 whole -- the whole line of questions as way beyond 24 Districts 8 and 9? 25 25 the scope. And just so it's clear, the Court A Not directly, no. Page 247 Page 249 requested that we consider the submission of O It was suggested during questioning of you that 1 1 2 Mr. Troupis' testimony by transcript to the court, 2 somehow you should have reached out to more people 3 3 in the Hispanic community. I believe there are 72 and the same request was made by counsel for 4 Mr. Troupis and I agreed to try to do that. 4 counties in the state. Did you talk to someone in every county about the redistricting process? 5 And so at this point you're way beyond 5 6 the scope and he's not your witness. He is our 6 Α 7 7 MR. POLAND: Object to the form. witness. We identified him as a witness and there 8 was a motion to the court. You did not object to 8 MR. EARLE: Join. 9 9 THE WITNESS: No, of course not. us subpoenaing him to the trial as a witness, and 10 it was Judge Stadtmueller's request that you do 10 BY MR. HODAN: 11 his deposition first and recommended that we then 11 Ο I believe there are other over a thousand 12 submit the deposition in lieu of live testimony. 12 municipalities in the state. Did you talk to 13 13 So under those circumstances you are so far astray someone in each of municipalities about their 14 from the scope of the examination and I object and 14 various concerns? 15 15 **A** move to strike the whole line of questioning. No. of course not. 16 MR. POLAND: I also believe you're 16 Q You were asked some questions about MALDEF? 17 trying to use him as an expert witness in 17 Α 18 redistricting now and he's an undisclosed expert. 18 Q Do you recall when it was that you contacted 19 19 MALDEF? He can't testify as an expert. He's a fact 20 witness. That's what he's here for. 20 **A** My best recollection is that I was first given 21 21 Nina Perales' name in May of last year, and that MR. HODAN: Mr. Troupis was not named 22 by the plaintiffs in the pretrial report as a 22 I -- I placed a call to her first and then was referred to Elisa Alfonso in the Chicago office 23 witness, so I --23 24 MR. EARLE: He was named in the --24 and called her in early June. 25 25 Q And why did you reach out to MALDEF? MR. HODAN: This is my record to make,

		Page 250			Page 252
1	A	Because the issue had been because there was an	1		opinion?
2		issue raised with regard to the Latino districts	2	A	Yes. I mean, throughout this process I asked her
3		in Milwaukee, and MALDEF is in my view was the	3		and she had others on the phone on occasion that I
4		premier defense, the premier fund or premier group	4		would ask as well.
5		of lawyers working on behalf of redistricting	5	Q	Okay. And had you met her before?
6		around the country on behalf of the various	6	A	No, no, I had not.
7		Hispanic populations. They've been involved in a	7	Q	Did you eventually get did she get back to you
8		number of other legal battles over the years,	8		at all after you sent information to her?
9		including Illinois. So, you know, and so when	9	A	Yes, she did.
10		Dr. or Professor Gaddie suggested I give them a	10	Q	Okay. And what did she say when she got back to
11		call, I did.	11		you?
12	Q	Okay. Were you seeking their opinion about	12	A	She indicated to me that when they looked at the
13		Districts 8 and 9?	13		numbers to try to determine the most effective
14	Α	Yes.	14		districts, that for the community that
15		MR. EARLE: Form.	15		MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the
16		THE WITNESS: Yes.	16		questions and the answer on hearsay grounds.
17	BY	MR. HODAN:	17	BY N	MR. HODAN:
18	Q	Were you seeking their opinion pardon me. Were	18	Q	Okay. You can go ahead and answer.
19	Ą	you seeking tell me again, who at MALDEF did	19	A A	Okay. That they believed that a configuration of
20		you speak to?	20		60-53, 60-54 voting age population was was the
21	A	Elisa Alfonso, I believe is her name. I met her	21		best alternative. So that's what she indicated to
22	Α.		22		us and she sent us actually sent maps to that
23	0	for the first time yesterday.	23		effect.
	Q	Did you talk to her on the phone?	23		
24	A	Yes.			MR. EARLE: I'm going to object and
25	Q	All right. Did you elicit her opinion about the	25		move to strike.
		Page 251			Page 253
1		Page 251	1		Page 253
1	Δ	configuration of District No. 8?	1	BV i	MR. POLAND: Join.
2	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I	2		MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN:
2 3	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information	2 3	BY I	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After
2 3 4	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of	2 3 4		MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything
2 3 4 5	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that	2 3 4 5		MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that
2 3 4 5 6	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and	2 3 4 5 6	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation?
2 3 4 5 6 7	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Q	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	configuration of District No. 8? Well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I said this is what we have, but either way, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I said this is what we have, but either way, it's the basic building block for redistricting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm. MR. DAUGHTERY: JRT87. Okay. Okay,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I said this is what we have, but either way, it's the basic building block for redistricting. During your call did she indicate whether she	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm. MR. DAUGHTERY: JRT87. Okay. Okay, we're fine, thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I said this is what we have, but either way, it's the basic building block for redistricting. During your call did she indicate whether she would review the information that you looked at,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm. MR. DAUGHTERY: JRT87. Okay. Okay, we're fine, thanks. MR. HODAN: And you have a copy of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	well, not initially. We we initially, I offered to provide her with all of the information regarding Milwaukee and the south side of Milwaukee that we had with the expectation that she could review it, MALDEF could review it and decide what type of district, what kind of district they believe would be most effective in representing the community. And so that's so initially I provided her with information. Okay. And do you recall what information you provided her with? We provided her all of the information we had on that area from the demographic or the census data by census tract through the through that entire area. She was very familiar with it because they were involved in Illinois using the same census date. So she may have just asked me for it or I said this is what we have, but either way, it's the basic building block for redistricting. During your call did she indicate whether she would review the information that you looked at, that you provided her?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	MR. POLAND: Join. MR. HODAN: Did you ever memorialize strike that. After that conversation did you ever mention anything about did you mention to anyone else that conversation? Yes. Okay. And who would you have talked to? Either Tad or Adam as well as Eric and others on our team. I'd ask you to look at Exhibit 1166. Yes, I looked at it. Okay. MR. DAUGHTERY: Just hold on one second. I'm going to check to make sure this isn't one of the ones you're certain this is not one of the ones that's off? MR. HODAN: This is JRT87, if you'll just look at it and just confirm. MR. DAUGHTERY: JRT87. Okay. Okay, we're fine, thanks. MR. HODAN: And you have a copy of JRT87?

		Page 254		Page 256
1		about.	1	MR. EARLE: Form.
2		MR. EARLE: It can be talked about?	2	BY MR. HODAN:
3		MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes.	3	Q And I believe you testified earlier that the
4	BY	MR. HODAN:	4	Hispanic voting age population under Act 43 in
5	Q	Can you tell me what is this is an e-mail that	5	District 9 is 54 percent; correct?
6		you sent?	6	A Yes.
7	A	Yes. There's actually yes, it is.	7	Q Okay. And is that slightly is that higher or
8	Q	There are a number of e-mails.	8	lower than what MALDEF had proposed?
9	A	Yeah, that's what I was trying to figure out.	9	A We were it's slightly higher.
10		Sometimes I'm a little obtuse in the way I write	10	Q So that would have fair to say that would have
11		these things.	11	been an improvement over what MALDEF had proposed?
12	Q	That's all right. When we have the modern day	12	A Yes.
13		string e-mails, sometimes it's difficult to figure	13	MR. EARLE: Object to the form for the
14		out which is which.	14	last question.
15	A	Right. It appears to be two separate e-mails.	15	BY MR. HODAN:
16	Q	Well, let's talk about the one on the bottom. Is	16	Q Well, do you believe that that's an improvement
17		that an e-mail that you drafted on July 11, 2011	17	over what MALDEF proposed?
18		at 2:24 p.m.?	18	A Yes, I do.
19	A	Yes, it is.	19	Q Now, you were also asked about whether anyone
20	Q	And who did you draft it to?	20	reached out to the Milwaukee community and there
21	A	I was writing to Tad and Adam. As I reflected a	21	was some suggestion that no one in this process
22		minute ago, I thought I had communicated with them	22	had reached out to the Milwaukee community?
23		about this issue.	23	MR. EARLE: I'm going to object to the
24	Q	In the first line appears to indicate that you	24	characterization of the testimony and the answer
25		spoke to the attorneys at MALDEF.	25	to the question. If there was a suggestion, it
1	A	Page 255 Yes.	1	Page 257 was by the deponent in answer to the questions.
2	Q	Who were you referring to when you said attorneys?	2	BY MR. HODAN:
3	A	Elise and others. I'm trying to think of the	3	Q Do you recall whether anyone on your team reached
4		other person's name. I was certainly referring to	4	out to anyone in Milwaukee regarding the assembly
5		her that I talked to.	5	Districts 8 or 9?
6	Q	And then it reads they have been working with the	6	A Yes.
7		maps and would like to propose a middle ground	7	Q And anyone in the Milwaukee community?
8		where 8 has 65 percent total pop, 60 percent vap,	8	A Yes, they did.
9		and 9 has 60 percent total pop, 53 percent vap,	9	Q And who did they reach out to?
10		and a north district, south district	10	A Well, I think we talked a little bit ago. First
11		configuration. What did you mean by that?	11	of all, I believe that I reached out to those,
12	A	Well, this is referring to the map that they had	12	that community fairly directly through MALDEF and
13		sent us at this point in time and I think there	13	this, this e-mail actually reflects that and from
14		must be out there somewhere and these were the	14	the beginning I had indicated that they
15		percentages that they had thought would be most	15	certainly that they should do that if they wished
16		effective for the community and they were making	16	and if they believed it was appropriate and that I
17		this proposal in response to the specifics that	17	assumed that they would. In addition, as the
18	_	I had provided to them the month before.	18	hearing ultimately reflects, there were a number
19	Q	And how does the I believe you said before that	19	of, people, Zeus Rodriguez, Manny Perez, and Bob
20		the Hispanic voting age population in District 8	20	Spindel and others that had been at least
21	_	under Act 43 is 60 percent; correct?	21	contacted by the team for the purposes of the
22	A	Yes.	22	hearing.
23	Q	And that is the same percentage that, is that the	23	Q Now, during the redistricting process had you ever
24		same percentage that MALDEF was suggesting?	24	heard of plaintiffs Voces de la Frontera?
25	A	Yes, it is.	25	A As I think I told Peter just a little bit ago, my

	Page 25	3	Page 260
1	first knowledge of it simply comes from that	1	BY MR. HODAN:
2	e-mail we looked at a minute which had it attache		Q You were asked about experts that you were trying
3	as a press release. That would have been the only	3	1 3 3 5
4	knowledge I have.	4	Professor Mayer?
5	Q So the second paragraph of your July 11, 2011	5	A Yes.
6	e-mail to Tad and Adam, you indicate they are also	6	Q And when was that?
7	reaching out today to Milwaukee connections in the	7	A Probably e-mails to this effect. I believe it was
8	Latino community, so this will likely become a	8	in June of 2011.
9	more dynamic process. When you say they, who are	9	Q And did he ever indicate to you whether he would
10	you referring to?	10	be willing to testify on behalf of the maps?
11	A MALDEF.	11	MR. EARLE: Object to form of that
12	Q Do you know if they reached out to the their	12	question. On behalf of the maps in June?
13	Milwaukee connections?	13	BY MR. HODAN:
14	A I only know what they told me.	14	Q Did he ever indicate that he would be willing to
15	Q And what did they tell you?	15	testify to defend the maps?
16	MR. EARLE: Object to hearsay.	16	MR. EARLE: Same objection.
17	MR. POLAND: Join in the objection.	17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	BY MR. HODAN:	18	BY MR. HODAN:
19	Q What did they tell you?	19	Q And what did he say to you?
20	A That they had reached out and they had spoken to	20	A That he was
21	members of the Latino community in Milwaukee.	21	MR. EARLE: I'm going to object on the
22	Q And did they tell you	22	grounds of foundation. There's not even any
23	MR. EARLE: Move to strike.	23	foundation that any maps existed in June that
24	THE WITNESS: That they were	24	would be defended.
25	supportive of this proposal that they were making,	25	MR. POLAND: It calls for hearsay.
	Page 25)	Page 261
1	that MALDEF was making.	1	MR. EARLE: And it calls for hearsay
2	MR. EARLE: Object to the hearsay and	2	as well.
3	move to strike.	3	MR. HODAN: You can always ask your
4	MR. POLAND: Join in the objections.	4	expert at trial and we will.
5	BY MR. HODAN:	5	MR. EARLE: He's being deposed right
6	Q At any time during this entire process did anyone	6	now.
7	from MALDEF ever tell you that they didn't approve	7	BY MR. HODAN:
8	of the final maps?	8	Q Can you tell us what he said?
9	MR. EARLE: I'm going to object.	9	MR. EARLE: I'm going to hearsay
10	You're asking him for a lengthy hearsay and you're	10	objection, move to strike.
11	leading as well, and I'll move to strike his	11	MR. POLAND: Join.
12	answer as soon as it comes in.	12	BY MR. HODAN:
13	THE WITNESS: Well, let's try another.	13	Q You can go ahead.
14	The not until the day of the hearing did I hear	14	A I believe there are maybe e-mails to this fact
15	anything from MALDEF that suggested that our	15	but that memorialize this, but at the time it
16	that the proposal that was being suggested, the	16	was my understanding he was prepared to testify on
17		17	behalf of the maps.
18	BY MR. HODAN:	18	Q You were asked before some questions about the
19	Q And what did you hear?	19	process, and the the leadership and how they
20	MR. POLAND: Objection.	20	would have access to the entire map but the other
21	MR. EARLE: Same objection.	21	legislators would not.
22	MR. HODAN: I'll withdraw.	22	A Yes.
23	MR. EARLE: Hearsay line and I'll move	23	Q Why was that?
24	to strike the answer.	24	MR. EARLE: Form.
25	MR. HODAN: I'll withdraw.	25	THE WITNESS: I thought I explained it
<u> </u>			

		Page 262		Page 264
1		a little bit earlier that traditionally that's the	1	questions at this time.
2		best way to avoid members of the legislature in	2	MR. EARLE: I have just a few.
3		from themselves from dealing with matters that	3	MR. POLAND: Do you want me to go
4		frankly didn't affect them and it is commonplace	4	first? I have just a couple.
5		at the legislature that, you know, folks will,	5	MR. HODAN: It's only 10:30, so
6		in fact, think about some other part of the state	6	whoever wants to go is free to go.
7		when it would thus become an impossible process	7	MR. POLAND: I don't have much. I do
8		because individual legislators would not focus on	8	want to mark this as an Exhibit 233. This is a
9		that their particular issues on which they knew	9	document
10		what was needed or not needed.	10	THE WITNESS: Let the record reflect
11		And so over time the process that	11	to Judge Stadtmueller that Troupis has sat here
12		evolved that here in Wisconsin in the legislature,	12	throughout and never complained.
13		I mean, again, this is not just today in the	13	MR. DAUGHTERY: And just to be clear
14		cycle, is that you would traditionally not share	14	too, I think we're past the seven hours but in any
15		the entire map until all members had been	15	event
16		consulted on their areas of their districts and so	16	MR. POLAND: This is a document that
17		that they could have a complete map only at the	17	is on the list. I just need to make a record,
18		end of the process. It was the only practical way	18	okay?
19		of getting it done.	19	MR. DAUGHTERY: Let me
20	BY	MR. HODAN:	20	MR. POLAND: I just need to make a
21	Q	You were also asked questions about the process of	21	record.
22		drawing the map. Do you have any familiarity with	22	EXAMINATION
23		the legislative process in terms of how bills are	23	(Exhibit No. 233 was marked for
24		drafted?	24	identification.)
25	A	Yes.	25	
		Page 263		Page 265
1	Q	Okay. Is it unusual in the legislative process	1	BY MR. POLAND:
2		for an individual member or members to draft bills	2	Q Mr. Troupis, the court reporter has handed you a
3		and keep them secret before they share them with	3	document that's marked as Exhibit 233. I'll
4		the public?	4	represent for the record that it is Bate stamped
5	A	Oh, no.	5	MBF000218. This is a document, as I've informed
6		MR. EARLE: Object to form.	6	your counsel, that is on the record or is on the
7	BY	MR. HODAN:	7	list of documents that Judge Dow, I believe, had
8	Q	You can go ahead and answer.	8	indicated we're not to ask about.
9	A	No, that's the normal process.	9	MR. DAUGHTERY: This is Bate stamped
10	Q	Nothing unusual about that?	10	JRT81 amongst the submissions we made yesterday,
11	A	No, nothing.	11	guess it was, and this morning the Court
12		MR. EARLE: Leading.	12	instructed counsel not to ask questions about it.
13	BY	MR. HODAN:	13	MR. POLAND: Don, I'm sorry, JRT what?
14	Q	Is there anything unusual about that?	14	MR. DAUGHTERY: 81.
15	A	No. It's the normal process.	15	BY MR. POLAND:
16	Q	Was that were you following that process?	16	Q Mr. Troupis, you recall that you were asked a
17	A	Yes.	17	series of questions by Mr. Hodan about
18		MR. EARLE: Leading.	18	conversations you had with Dr. Mayer; correct?
19	BY	MR. HODAN:	19	A I recall him asking some questions about
20	Q	How would you compare your process with the norma	20	Dr. Mayer, yes.
21		legislative process in terms of not disclosing the	21	Q And you indicated you had conversations with
22		maps until you were ready to go public with them?	22	Dr. Mayer about potentially coming to work as an
23	A	I would view that as the ordinary process by which	23	expert in the redistricting process; correct?
24		this would redistricting would go forward.	24	A Whatever Mr. Hodan asked, I answered.
		MR. HODAN: I have no further	25	Q You said that you thought that was reflected in
25				Tod said that you thought that was renected in

		Page 266		Page 268
1		the series of e-mails, correct, the conversations	1	strike and agree to strike all questions relating
2		you had with Dr. Mayer?	2	
3	A	If that's what I said, that's what I said. The	3	3
4		record is what it is.	4	
5	Q	Okay. So I believe that Mr. Hodan has opened it	5	issue.
6		up by answering the questions that Mr. Troupis has	6	MR. POLAND: That's fine and I
7		opened up, at least in the very first part of	7	withdraw the question.
8		Exhibit 233, for cross-examination.	8	MR. DAUGHTERY: Actually could we just
9		MR. DAUGHTERY: He's not going to	9	tear this up because I don't know what's going to
10		answer.	10	happen in regard to this being bound and who's
11		MR. POLAND: I need to ask the	11	going to get it.
12		question. I know you have the instruction. I'm	12	MR. HODAN: Let the record reflect
13		just making my record. That's my that's my	13	that we have reached an agreement where all
14		that's my	14	questions related to Dr. Ken Mayer that were asked
15		MR. HODAN: And let me make a record.	15	are withdrawn and stricken from the record by
16		I didn't ask him anything about this document and	16	agreement of counsel so that there isn't any
17		I don't I don't believe Mr. Mayer was ever	17	7 confusion or any disagreement about the scope or
18		retained by Mr. Troupis.	18	8 of waiver.
19		THE WITNESS: Let me make my record,	19	THE WITNESS: Thank you. I appreciate
20		which is that it was not my intention in answering	20	that.
21		any question here to open up any matter that is	21	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Excuse me. Two
22		otherwise attorney-client privilege and if I	22	2 minutes of disk.
23		inadvertently did so, I I apologize to	23	, and the second
24		everybody concerned and indicate that it was not	24	,
25		my intention and I certainly would not do that in	25	5 MR. POLAND: That's it, I'm done.
		Page 267		Page 269
1		considering my ethical obligation not to.	1	MR. EARLE: I might be able to get in
2		MR. DAUGHTERY: And to be clear too,	2	in two minutes.
3		the Court's order this morning pursuant to the	3	3 EXAMINATION
4		Supreme Court rules is in regards to documents	4	BY MR. EARLE:
5		other than these ones that we've identified as not	5	Q 96, you have it in front of you?
6		being able to talk about. So you're not relieved	6	A Yes.
7		from that ethical obligation with regard to	7	7 Q You said earlier you had mentioned that you didn't
8		you're not relieved from your ethical obligations	8	do a full-blown Jingles type analysis but you
9		with regard to this by the Supreme Court rule.	9	implied that you had considered those types of
10		THE WITNESS: I certainly would not	10	O criteria?
11		comment. I just want to make the record clear	11	1 A Oh, I considered all those factors, that's
12		that if I inadvertently it was inadvertent and	12	correct.
13		I take it back.	13	3 Q Okay. So did you consider what the differential
14	BY	MR. POLAND:	14	
15	Q	Mr. Troupis, I'd like to ask you a question about	15	•
16		the first sentence the first three sentences of	16	į į į
17		Exhibit No. 233. Will you answer questions about	17	
18		the first three sentences of Exhibit 233?	18	-
19		MR. DAUGHTERY: I'm instructing him	19	_
20		not to answer.	20	5
	D*-	AND DOLLAND		MR. EARLE: I'll rephrase it.
21		MR. POLAND:	21	-
21 22	Q	Mr. Troupis	22	2 BY MR. EARLE:
21 22 23		Mr. Troupis And I will follow my attorney's advice.	22 23	2 BY MR. EARLE: 3 Q When you drew the 9th the 8th assembly
21 22	Q	Mr. Troupis	22	2 BY MR. EARLE: 3 Q When you drew the 9th the 8th assembly 4 district, you will agree that the northern part of

		Page 270			Page 272
1		than did the lower part of the district; correct?	1		MR. EARLE: Yes.
2	A	I don't know that.	2		THE WITNESS: You know, honestly
3	A	MR. HODAN: Lack of foundation.	3		I don't. I just don't recall.
4			4		MR. EARLE:
5		THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I just don't know that.	5	0	Did any member of your team have any understanding
6	DV	MR. EARLE:	6	•	of the racially polarized voting patterns in the
7	Q	Did you consider the turnout rate differentials	7		
8	Q	between those areas of the districts in the Latino	8	A	southern part of the new 8th?
9		community that had higher levels of Latino	9		Well, we certainly didn't believe that it that
10		concentrations as compared to the areas that had	10		that would overcome, that that racially polarized voting was so great that it would overcome the
11		lower levels of Latino concentrations?	11		districts that we were creating. So in that sense
12		MR. HODAN: Object to the form.	12		we certainly did.
13		MR. DAUGHTERY: To be clear, you,	13	Q	And you would agree that it turns out that it
14		you're talking about him personally?	14	•	would have overcome that it turns out that it would have overcome that strike the question.
		MR. EARLE: Yes, that was the	15		I'm going to withdraw it. Draw your attention to
15 16		question.	16		1166. Let's stop.
17		THE WITNESS: I don't recall.	17		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends disk
18	pv	MR. EARLE:	18		number three of the video of James R. Troupis on
19	Q	Did any member of the team consider those factors	19		February 22, 2012. The time 10:43 p.m.
20	Ą	related to turnout differentials between Latinos	20		(Discussion off the record.)
21		and whites in the 8th assembly district?	21		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the
22		MR. HODAN: Lack of foundation.	22		beginning of disk number four of the video
23		THE WITNESS: Again, I don't recall.	23		deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22,
24	DV	MR. EARLE:	24		2012. The time 10:47 p.m.
25	Q	Did you consider whether there was any patterns of			2012. The time 10.47 p.m.
20	Q	Did you consider whether there was any patterns of	20		
		Page 271			Page 273
1		racially polarized voting between amongst the	1	BY N	MR. EARLE:
2		white voters in the vicinity of the Latino	2	Q	Drawing your attention to Exhibit 1166, Attorney
3		community?	3		Hodan asked you a series of questions about this
4	A	Yes, we did look at that.	4		exhibit?
5	Q	How did you look at that?	5	A	Did he? If he did, he did.
6	A	Well, we knew the election results from prior	6	Q	In particular I want to draw your attention to the
7		series of a series of prior elections in the	7		configuration comment, north district, south
8		area, and so we were aware that as an example,	8		district configuration. Do you see that this?
9		that the 58th percent district had consistently	9	A	Yes.
10		elected a Latino for almost ten years. So we	10	Q	This is referring to the MALDEF proposal?
11		certainly from that could infer that there was not	11	A	It appears to be, yes.
12		the kind of polarized voting that one might	12	Q	And the district submitted by MALDEF had an
13		otherwise have thought.	13		east did not have a north-south configuration,
14	Q	And you're referring to the election of Pedro	14		it had an east-west configuration; is that
15		Colon?	15		correct?
16	A	Yes, and JoCasta.	16	A	I don't remember and maybe it's because I've been
17	Q	In the old 8th assembly district?	17		sitting here for seven or eight hours. I just
18	A	Correct, yes.	18		don't remember. If you have what was attached.
19	Q	Did you have any idea about patterns of racially	19		MR. EARLE: Mark that as an exhibit.
20		polarized voting in the areas that the	20		(Exhibit No. 234 was marked for
		45 percent that you added on to the eastern half	21		identification.)
21		of the 8th assembly district that came from the	22	BY N	MR. EARLE:
21 22		or the our appearanty district that earne from the			
I		old 9th?	23	Q	Let start at the back page. I'm pretty sure that
22		•	23 24	•	Let start at the back page. I'm pretty sure that I'm certain that this is not on the list, but
22 23		old 9th?		•	

		Page 274			Page 276
1		Go ahead.	1	Q	Okay, and you communicate to them that you've
2	BY	MR. EARLE:	2		taken their proposal a bit further and you say you
3	Q	If you start at the last page, if you start with	3		think your proposal will work a little better than
4		the e-mail dated July 11, 2011, at 6:41 p.m.	4		theirs; correct?
5	A	I don't believe it's a complete document. Maybe	5	A	Well, I say exactly what I say.
6		it is. I just	6	Q	Okay. Let's go to the first page. That e-mail
7	Q	I remove the hearsay components of it. So this is	7		was sent at 6:41 p.m. to MALDEF; correct?
8		your communication with the folks from MALDEF and	8	A	It would appear so, yes, sir.
9		if you would look at the e-mail	9	Q	And this is two days before the hearing; right?
10		MR. HODAN: Excuse me. When you say	10	A	July 11 is two days before July 13, yes.
11		you remove the hearsay	11	Q	Then at 6:42 on the 11th you sent an e-mail to
12		MR. EARLE: I remove the communication	12		Ottman, Foltz and McLeod and Ray Taffora in
13		from MALDEF to Mr. Troupis.	13		capital letters saying e-mail I sent below to try
14		MR. HODAN: From this exhibit?	14		to persuade MALDEF, will see.
15		MR. EARLE: No, it's not an exhibit.	15	A	Yes.
16		I mean, this is an e-mail string starting with Jim	16	Q	And you're going to try to persuade them to drop
17		Troupis' response. He sent an e-mail on July 11,	17		their east-west configuration in favor of a
18		6:41, to Elisa Alfonso and Alonzo Rivas.	18		north-south configuration; isn't that true?
19		MR. HODAN: Counsel, what I'm just	19	A	Had nothing to do with east-west, north-south. It
20		trying to figure out is what you removed from the	20		had everything to do with the percentages.
21		document.	21	Q	In fact, it had to do with the boundaries, didn't
22		MR. EARLE: I didn't remove anything	22		it?
23		from this document. This is a single e-mail.	23	A	It had to do with the percentages.
24		MR. HODAN: Okay. I thought you said	24	Q	Mr. Troupis, it had to do with a ripple effect,
25		you would remove. Maybe I misheard you.	25		didn't it?
		Page 275			Page 277
1		MR. DAUGHTERY: Just for the record,	1		MR. DAUGHTERY: Asked and answered.
2		I'm not sure, since it's not a complete document,	2		MR. HODAN: Asked and answered,
3		I would object on those grounds, but in any event,	3		argumentative.
4		go ahead.	4		THE WITNESS: And I will add again
5		THE WITNESS: Let me raise what I mean	5		that the second e-mail, 6:41 p.m., the one you're
6		by not complete here, folks. I'm looking at the	6		referring to and now trying to imply or infer
7		second page and it says our alternative and it	7		things is not complete. So I mean, it's this
8		just shows one number and I don't know where the	8		is misleading.
9		other number is.	9	BY	MR. EARLE:
10		MR. EARLE:	10	Q	All right. So then the next communication from
11	Q	I'm not going to ask you about the maps that were	11		you to the team about MALDEF is the next the
12		attached. You can see that they had an attachment	12		next day on the 12th; correct? That's
13		and an alternative and the	13		Exhibit 209.
14	A	The record needs to reflect that I don't think	14		MR. HODAN: Objection, foundation.
15		this is a complete version of these e-mails.	15		What exhibit are we looking at?
16		I don't know what's been removed. I will testify	16	DV	MR. DAUGHTERY: Exhibit 209.
17 18		as best I can, but I'm just saying based upon the	17		MR. EARLE:
19		second page, there's pieces of this are missing. So go ahead and ask me what you want and I'll do	18 19	Q	And this is where you report that MALDEF is going to publicly endorse your map; correct? We've
20		the best I can.	20		already asked you about that.
21	Q	All right. Well the date and time, it's Monday,	21	A	Well, there were e-mails in between this. So
22	Ą	July 11 at 6:41 p.m., you responding to Elisa	22	-1	again, you're that you're inaccurate because
23		Alfonso and Alonzo Rivas after having received	23		there are not complete e-mails and this is not the
24		some some proposals from them; correct?	24		next one in the sequence, this being 209.
25	A	Yes.	25	Q	What's the next one in the sequence?
					•

1		Page 278		Page 280
1	A	Well, as far as I can tell, I don't know because	1	STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2		I don't have a complete record here. It looks to	2	MILWAUKEE COUNTY) SS:
3		me like there's I can't even tell looking at	3	I, MICHELLE HAGEN, Registered
4		234. For example, there's an e-mail at the top of	4	Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
5		234 that doesn't have any heading at all. Tad,	5	State of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the deposition
6		I'm going to go forward.	6	of JAMES R. TROUPIS was taken before me at Godfrey &
7		So what I'm saying is I just don't	7	Kahn, S.C., 780 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin,
8		know what was the next in the sequences. I'm not	8	on the 22nd day of February, 2012, commencing at 3:34
9		suggesting that this, that is, 209 that I	9	o'clock in the afternoon.
10		testified to earlier, happened I'm just your	10	That it was taken at the instance of
11		suggestion that somehow this is the next one in	11	the Plaintiffs upon verbal interrogatories.
12		time is simply incorrect based on these documents.	12	That said deposition was taken to be
13	O	And all of these e-mails culminate in your comment	13	used in an action now pending in the United States
14	Q	Ţ.	14	District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, in
15		about you succeeding in taking the largest legal fund for the Latino community off the table in any	15	which Alvin Baldus, et al., are the Plaintiffs and
			16	Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board
16		later court battle?		
17		MR. HODAN: Objection, asked and	17	et al., are the Defendants.
18		answered. I think you started with that question	18	APPEARANCES
19		before.	19	GODFEY & KAHN, S.C., 780 North Water
20		THE WITNESS: We discussed that	20	Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DOUGLAS M.
21	D	before.	21	POLAND, appeared on behalf of the Baldus Plaintiffs.
22		MR. EARLE:	22	LAW OFFICES OF PETER EARLE, 839 North
23	Q	But this is the culminating e-mail of that string,	23	Jefferson Street, Suite 300, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202,
24		isn't that? That's the question. That has not	24	by MR. PETER G. EARLE, appeared on behalf of the Voces de
25		been asked before.	25	la Frontera Plaintiffs.
		B 270		
		Page 279		Page 281
1	A	Page 2/9 I don't know.	1	Page 281 REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C.,
1 2	A		1 2	
	A	I don't know.		REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C.,
2	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of	2	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
2 3	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation.	2	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E.
2 3 4	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the	2 3 4	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants.
2 3 4 5	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one.	2 3 4 5	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
2 3 4 5 6	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end.	2 3 4 5 6	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis.	2 3 4 5 6 7	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m. (At 10:56 p.m. the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause. That the foregoing is a full, true and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m. (At 10:56 p.m. the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause. That the foregoing is a full, true and correct record of all the proceedings had in the matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m. (At 10:56 p.m. the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause. That the foregoing is a full, true and correct record of all the proceedings had in the matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m. (At 10:56 p.m. the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause. That the foregoing is a full, true and correct record of all the proceedings had in the matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A	I don't know. MR. HODAN: Objection, lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what the last one. MR. EARLE: With that we'll end. Thank you, Mr. Troupis. THE WITNESS: Thank you. Is the trial subpoena withdrawn so I can leave tomorrow? MR. DAUGHTERY: Yes. I assume it's withdrawn so MR. EARLE: Yeah. MR. DAUGHTERY: It's withdrawn, yes. MR. HODAN: We have a seven-hour, when did we start THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the video deposition of James R. Troupis on February 22, 2012. The time 10:56 p.m. (At 10:56 p.m. the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	REINHART, BOERNER, VAN DEUREN, S.C., 1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. PATRICK J. HODAN and MS. COLLEEN E. FIELKOW, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, 17 West Main Street, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857, by MS. MARIA S. LAZAR, appeared on behalf of the Defendants. WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C., 555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, by MR. DONALD A. DAUGHERTY, JR., appeared on behalf of the Deponent. TROUPIS LAW OFFICE LLC, 7609 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102, Middleton, Wisconsin 53562, by MR. BRANDON LEWIS, appeared on behalf of the Deponent. That said deponent, before examination, was sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth relative to said cause. That the foregoing is a full, true and correct record of all the proceedings had in the matter

	Page 282	
1	original machine shorthand notes taken at said time and	
2	place.	
4		
5		
6	Notary Public in and for	
7	the State of Wisconsin	
8	Dated this 23rd day of February, 2012,	
9	Milwaukee, Wisconsin.	
10	My commission expires August 10, 2014.	
11	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	HALMA-JILEK REPORTING, INC.	
23	(414) 271-4466	
24		
25		

A	10:18 80:9	advance 82:10	29:6,12,15	allows 43:2
ability 41:15	117:10,13	advice 16:15	31:12,16 34:25	Alonzo 125:10
	120:15,22,23	32:16 112:22	39:23 40:23	126:16 127:15
42:25 80:24	135:22 150:12	113:5,7 183:7	58:8 61:25	128:9,15 129:3
able 45:24 82:15				
84:12,21 120:8	150:14,15	267:23	62:8 63:14	274:18 275:23
125:20 202:13	152:3 195:14	advisable 35:6	66:22 67:13,16	alter 97:25
202:14 207:7	202:3,3 224:5	advised 110:10	68:6,11,17	122:4
215:23 225:23	237:17 239:5	110:14 111:1	69:6,18 70:2	alterations
	239:11 244:5	112:7 113:3	160:7,7 268:13	98:23
227:19 267:6	255:21 256:4	advising 9:8	268:16	altering 209:24
269:1	action 280:13	advisory 160:22	agreements	alternative
absence 118:9				
absolutely 19:20	activity 63:11	advocacy	56:11,13,14,16	119:17 120:25
82:15 121:25	84:23 136:25	145:17	57:3,9 58:20	252:21 275:7
189:19 190:5	acts 2:22 158:10	affect 96:8	58:24,25 59:4	275:13
213:3 227:21	actual 68:19	214:2,3 262:4	59:9 61:8	alternatives
accept 98:23	173:23 211:22	affidavits	62:20,23 63:12	119:3 134:12
	214:9 243:24	226:12	63:15 64:8,10	151:22
acceptable	Adam 61:21	affirmatively	64:20,21,22,25	Alvin 1:3 6:7
199:2	75:14 78:6	104:2	65:4 66:15,17	280:15
accepted 93:1	117:3 134:6	African-Ameri		
access 50:14			66:25 67:2,9	ambiguous
118:25 127:17	138:20,25	114:13 148:21	67:11 68:3	147:2
198:12 199:11	174:9 193:19	195:16 244:16	69:8,14	amenable 96:5
199:12 261:20	198:4,18 253:9	244:20,22	ahead 9:13 38:2	105:21
accommodating	254:21 258:6	245:2,14,18,25	42:24 47:23	amended 2:22
96:5	Adam's 206:19	246:4,8,19	52:19 58:1	amendment
	add 52:21	afternoon 3:2	126:16 130:13	192:13
accomplish	148:18 156:12	7:16 71:8	143:1 147:3	American
84:21 153:20	183:14 199:17	131:11 136:13	175:2 178:16	219:10
216:17	221:25 222:19	280:9	200:16,17	amount 31:7,21
account 31:1				
207:24 217:22	277:4	age 8:10,22 9:9	205:19 214:11	33:6 34:8,10
218:12	added 97:11	10:15 36:18	231:2,18 233:8	152:24 172:25
Accountability	271:21	91:15,22	239:25 246:12	AMY 1:5
1:13 2:2,12,15	addition 21:18	138:19 141:18	252:18 261:13	analysis 80:24
6:9,15 212:17	257:17	215:1 217:4,13	263:8 274:1	215:14 224:6
280:16	additional 25:2	241:4,10	275:4,19	269:8
	39:19	242:17 243:23	ahold 169:22	Andre 70:18
accounts 12:19	address 12:24	252:20 255:20	202:14	and/or 16:15
12:23	41:15 81:20,25	256:4	aides 8:7	17:20 163:17
accurate 7:23	102:1 110:19	agency 156:9	aisle 63:23 74:1	anomaly 45:2
39:6,10 42:6				•
42:11,13 46:14	194:2,11 195:2	ago 23:14 35:22	211:14	answer 9:13
46:17,21 54:19	198:9,19	36:9 86:2,6	al 6:8,9,13,15	19:13,13 24:5
56:7 89:6,7	209:22	99:19 130:25	280:15,17	24:11 26:21
95:12 96:9	addressed 141:5	139:18 149:7,7	aldermanic	42:24 43:9,11
102:19 116:2	195:4,22	158:12 189:8	140:7 145:7	47:24 52:9
126:21 135:18	246:15	194:15 208:2	146:3,6 241:13	58:1 79:16
	addresses 85:20	216:19 217:21	242:8 248:22	80:3 89:25
138:24 150:21	addressing	254:22 257:10	Alfonso 133:24	90:15 95:17
accurately	26:24 159:8	257:25	196:7 249:23	97:2 143:2
26:10,16				
122:23 125:18	adjacent 241:9	agree 40:15 60:1	250:21 274:18	146:21 147:3
achieved 98:6	adjoining	236:22 268:1	275:23	160:17 176:25
achieving 224:9	213:23	269:24 272:13	alive 54:20	199:4,10,23
224:10	adjustment	agreed 34:20	allegation	214:12 216:25
acknowledged	153:21	79:20,23,25	176:19 212:23	231:2,18
91:10	adopted 109:25	81:25 82:10	238:8	239:25 246:12
	211:24	103:15 172:5	allow 56:19	252:16,18
acknowledgm	adopting 211:9	247:4	117:25	256:24 257:1
135:5	adoption 110:4	agreeing 103:13	allowed 40:22	259:12,24
acronym 219:12	139:14	agreement 28:5	56:14,17 57:4	263:8 266:10
act 8:16 10:11	109.17	agreement 40.0	00.17,17 37.4	200.0 200.10
	I .	l	l .	I

267:17,20	281:11,15	251:14,16	213:12 219:13	192:15 223:21
answered 20:22	appears 37:16	271:8	223:20 235:24	223:22 236:1
60:8 66:21	39:3,4,22 40:5	areas 96:24	236:3 240:9	assistant 88:21
90:25 91:4	79:1 83:25	148:2 149:1	241:14 248:20	assisting 187:13
96:25 203:11	85:9,14 138:11	152:9 191:1	249:16 251:18	associate 77:24
I .			252:2 256:19	
265:24 277:1,2	151:1 161:10	194:16,20		associated 6:3
278:18	163:8,10,21	244:6 262:16	260:2 261:18	61:11 182:23
answering 266:6	164:4 166:10	270:8,10	262:21 265:16	assume 12:7
266:20	172:16 173:11	271:20	265:24 268:14	17:7 27:2
anticipated	175:20 176:2,4	argument 98:13	273:3 277:1,2	28:11 42:5
161:22 162:15	176:10 179:7	argumentative	277:20 278:17	45:9 56:18
anticipation	179:10,12	277:3	278:25	57:2,8,23
186:7	181:19 186:1	arisen 45:4,5	asking 13:6	58:12 73:24
anybody 13:1	188:11,13	210:6,23	24:25 57:16	75:22 88:16
67:5,8 72:4	191:25 192:2	arising 192:12	61:8 86:12	89:25 99:23
73:10 88:19	200:25 205:25	arranged 39:13	142:18,19	124:15 125:23
94:15,20,24	221:4 237:4	79:2,5,6,7,9	165:3 175:12	142:11 143:12
97:17 100:22	240:19 254:15	80:8	177:21 192:17	164:15 165:23
100:24 101:1	254:24 273:11	arrangement	192:22 193:25	167:8 172:10
109:23 135:15	appended	30:20 32:18	193:25 201:11	172:12 185:16
136:19 137:5,6	150:20	33:5 56:23	201:14 226:3	185:19 194:21
144:10 146:9	appointed 124:1	58:3 173:3,7	233:15 236:20	195:15,18,21
146:12 155:25	appreciate 9:25	arrangements	259:10 265:19	201:18 222:8
157:2,7 198:9	26:1 41:25	83:6 227:18	asks 166:15	222:10 232:4
224:7	43:15 94:11,13	arranging 79:12	192:3,4	279:10
anybody's 36:19	97:15 99:10	79:13	aspect 157:10	assumed 80:4
anytime 168:24	113:20 120:18	arrived 189:18	157:11	93:19 135:10
168:25 188:21	183:24,24	arrogance 52:10	aspects 41:13	160:4 257:17
anyway 234:25	184:8 192:14	arrogant 49:4	assemble 13:2,6	assuming
apart 27:8	243:22 268:19	52:8 165:14	assembly 9:10	127:19 136:15
apologize 14:8	appreciative	arrows 74:8	10:4,6 11:1	142.0
	wpp-co-wc-ro	allows 14.0	10.4,0 11.1	143:8
15:24 18:10	248:3	article 117:18	27:5 28:3	assumption
15:24 18:10 54:7,10,11				
	248:3	article 117:18	27:5 28:3	assumption
54:7,10,11	248:3 approach 98:10	article 117:18 117:19 119:19	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8	assumption 41:2 91:7
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approvimately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9 3:14,18,21,25	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1 146:24 147:6	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13 143:20,21	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment 108:17	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6 attitude 44:14
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9 3:14,18,21,25 26:12,17	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1 146:24 147:6 152:4,16	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13 143:20,21 155:2 163:16	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment 108:17 assignments	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6 attitude 44:14 attorney 3:16
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9 3:14,18,21,25 26:12,17 120:11 137:10	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1 146:24 147:6 152:4,16 182:10 191:8	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13 143:20,21 155:2 163:16 182:2 189:6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment 108:17 assignments 187:16	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6 attitude 44:14 attorney 3:16 6:22 7:1,1 13:5
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9 3:14,18,21,25 26:12,17 120:11 137:10 145:16 280:21	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1 146:24 147:6 152:4,16 182:10 191:8 191:10 195:11	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13 143:20,21 155:2 163:16 182:2 189:6 190:25 203:10	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment 108:17 assignments	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6 attitude 44:14 attorney 3:16 6:22 7:1,1 13:5 13:8,12 15:11
54:7,10,11 114:22 116:13 134:1 138:17 150:13 231:9 266:23 apparently 11:25 72:18 93:22 121:24 161:8 176:8,13 183:6 191:20 appear 26:20 83:20 93:16 171:4 184:6 276:8 appearance 135:19,25 136:8 181:23 181:25 appearances 6:20 appeared 3:6,9 3:14,18,21,25 26:12,17 120:11 137:10	248:3 approach 98:10 194:17 approached 106:5 approaching 165:2 appropriate 91:24 92:21 169:24 173:2 192:14 257:16 approve 30:18 30:19,22,22 259:7 approved 35:15 approximately 153:19 214:25 April 51:2 70:18 71:2 188:9,20 189:9,10,18 area 92:10 95:7 119:18 121:1 146:24 147:6 152:4,16 182:10 191:8	article 117:18 117:19 119:19 137:12,18,25 138:11 139:4,6 146:2 articles 137:6 145:15 221:21 222:15 aside 97:9 107:23 145:5 161:1 162:20 165:19 174:25 asked 11:6 13:21 18:1,2 26:14 31:15 43:9 44:25,25 55:6 57:13 76:19 79:23 80:1,3 90:4,5,6 90:10,19 93:24 95:11 103:12 108:17 143:13 143:20,21 155:2 163:16 182:2 189:6	27:5 28:3 38:25 40:8 43:13,21 46:19 102:16 142:12 149:13 150:7,9 150:19 153:16 156:6,10,13,14 157:2,8 162:8 171:16 186:25 194:7,9,10 211:18 212:3 216:10,12 233:2 248:23 257:4 269:16 269:18,23 270:21 271:17 271:22 Assemblyman 27:15 asserted 233:17 asserted 233:17 assertion 110:12 assignment 108:17 assignments 187:16 assist 108:5	assumption 41:2 91:7 143:20 176:17 assure 36:17 astray 247:13 attached 5:1 48:1 140:9 151:3 176:3 258:2 273:18 275:12 attachment 275:12 attempt 63:24 198:19 228:2 attempting 169:18 211:7 attention 152:19 155:6 161:11 179:9 185:5 206:6 221:3 272:15 273:2,6 attitude 44:14 attorney 3:16 6:22 7:1,1 13:5

75:18 88:21	104:20 107:11	87:11 113:18	31:1 36:12	276:2
93:21 94:20	116:21 138:11	174:12 178:25	37:14,23 38:22	black 92:14
141:9 240:10	143:24 147:8	257:14 272:22	39:13 42:25	122:24 197:1
273:2 281:6	149:21 155:17	begins 174:8	46:23 49:19	black-and-white
attorneys 8:7	165:17 168:22	194:23	50:10,11 52:13	105:16
254:25 255:2	170:14 182:7	behalf 3:6,9,14	52:16,24,25	blend 198:19
attorney's	183:5 185:5	3:18,21,25	53:3,9 54:3,16	block 251:20
267:23	188:16 189:13	6:21,23,25 7:4	54:21 56:4,12	blocks 211:18
attorney-client	189:14 191:23	7:6 28:6,9	56:20,22,25	211:20 212:2
12:10 69:25	198:18 208:14	38:23 40:3	57:7 58:5,11	blur 189:22
140:25 141:8	212:11 215:5	75:1 145:17	58:17 60:3,24	board 1:13 2:2
162:4,6,11,14	220:18,20	250:5,6 260:10	61:22 62:10	2:12,15 6:9,15
266:22	237:16 252:7	260:12 261:17	71:22 72:6,14	168:5 203:24
attribution	252:10 267:13	280:21,24	88:13,25 89:1	204:4 212:17
151:5	273:23	281:4,8,11,15	122:25 160:10	280:16
August 32:10	background	behest 151:16	160:11 161:8	boards 241:9
43:5 282:10	214:5	belabor 22:12	172:14 173:14	boat 192:11
Australia 51:2	backward 133:3	believe 8:25	182:14 186:14	Bob 257:19
189:10	bad 192:9	13:15 28:8	188:19 190:2	body 92:18
authenticate	242:19,19	32:10 34:1	207:22 229:20	142:3
41:15,20	badly 172:21	35:13 36:1	229:21 239:10	Boerner 3:11 7:2
automatically	balance 52:10	46:17 55:12	246:4 249:20	37:14,24 281:1
30:23	Baldus 1:3 3:6	64:21 67:14	252:21 262:2	bold 140:24
auton 59:16	6:8,23 158:4,5	75:18 79:19	275:17,20	book 169:9
available 51:8	280:15,21	84:7,8 91:23	Best's 27:20	BOONE 1:6,7
129:18	BALDWIN 1:10	92:4 93:2,24	46:15 53:12,17	bottom 15:5
Avenue 3:24	bankers 180:17	117:15 118:8	better 29:20	161:11 163:5,7
281:14	BARBERA 1:6	118:18,22	34:5,11 66:1	166:9 183:21
avoid 121:19	BARLAND 1:15	126:24 127:1	76:9 81:22	183:25 254:16
262:2	2:14	130:23 131:3	84:12 93:14	bound 268:10
avoided 218:12	based 30:25	137:25 159:22	98:6 116:3	boundaries 96:8
aware 9:20 22:1	42:23 56:25	160:13,14,16	142:12 143:25	121:3 209:3,23
55:17 144:9,12	57:16 122:15	160:17 164:23	146:23 180:23	210:4,7,17
145:8,15 148:1	149:4 164:4	169:25 179:14	181:3,8,12	211:19,23
148:13,18	168:12 206:19	180:13 199:12	182:23 276:3	276:21
150:2 187:4	275:17 278:12	221:19 222:5	beyond 45:13	boundary
210:7 225:5	basic 48:16	224:9 240:9,17	98:14 99:1	121:20 210:12
227:12,13	251:20	246:13,13	101:17 102:6	210:23
230:23 233:1,4	basically 45:19	247:16 249:3	246:22,24	bounds 234:19
271:8	88:6 89:5	249:11 250:21	247:5	Box 3:17 281:7
awful 134:25	150:24	251:8 255:19	BIENDSEIL 1:4	boy 54:25 55:2,4
a.m 77:19 78:21	basis 15:7,10	256:3,16	big 21:4 183:12	55:20
80:19 81:14	31:2,18 33:6	257:11 260:7	bigger 34:2	Brandon 3:25
82:20 83:16	35:23 50:15	261:14 265:7	bill 32:13 33:25	7:7 77:23
85:8 221:9	51:20 59:24	266:5,17 272:8	34:2	281:15
	73:20 167:7	274:5	billed 32:17	break 9:18 48:7
B	batch 248:16	believed 24:19	billing 30:25	107:6 127:21
B 4:8	Bate 11:19	34:2,3 105:21	32:6,9	BRENNAN 1:14
back 12:14 14:6	219:18 265:4,9	106:4 121:24	billings 33:9	2:13
14:7 15:1 20:8	Bates 78:8,11	252:19 257:16	bills 172:24	BRETT 1:4
25:4,8 32:19	battle 126:10	benefit 126:16	262:23 263:2	brief 107:5
33:3 35:5	129:15 278:16	144:2 218:8	bit 49:4 102:4	briefly 188:18
43:18 44:5	battles 250:8	benefits 127:14	132:10 158:12	brilliant 183:6
48:13 51:13	beat 185:18	Bernie 169:17	189:6 196:2	bring 134:10
53:11 59:15	BECHEN 1:3	199:25	201:2 206:11	bringing 84:13
62:22 82:17	beer 166:21	best 27:9 28:1,6	215:18 217:21	bristled 55:21
83:22 85:24,25	began 45:3	29:7,12 30:10	239:3 257:10	broken 189:20
95:9 103:14,16	beginning 6:5	30:12,16,17	257:25 262:1	brought 11:14

Buchen 180:12 build 182:15 building 207:21 251:20 BUMPUS 1:4 bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:4,15,16 :25 80:2 :18 96:23 0:1 171:19 ELENE 1:3 :1:9 2:10 7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :s 82:8	273:24 certainly 9:2,2 9:20 10:24 12:17 14:15 16:9,9 20:22 36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11 217:9 218:17	121:20 178:16 211:8 changed 80:21 211:23 changes 96:24 98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	chuckling 67:22 CINDY 1:6 circle 123:7 Circuit 21:21 circulating 172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
Buchen 180:12 build 182:15 building 207:21 251:20 CAR BUMPUS 1:4 bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:25 80:2 :18 96:23 0:1 171:19 :LENE 1:3 :1:9 2:10 7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :8 82:8	9:20 10:24 12:17 14:15 16:9,9 20:22 36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	211:8 changed 80:21 211:23 changes 96:24 98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	CINDY 1:6 circle 123:7 Circuit 21:21 circulating 172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
build 182:15 building 207:21 251:20 BUMPUS 1:4 bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:18 96:23 0:1 171:19 :LENE 1:3 1:9 2:10 7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :8 82:8	9:20 10:24 12:17 14:15 16:9,9 20:22 36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	changed 80:21 211:23 changes 96:24 98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	circle 123:7 Circuit 21:21 circulating 172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
building 207:21 251:20 BUMPUS 1:4 bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	0:1 171:19 ELENE 1:3 1:9 2:10 7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :8 82:8	12:17 14:15 16:9,9 20:22 36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	211:23 changes 96:24 98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	Circuit 21:21 circulating 172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
251:20 BUMPUS 1:4 bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	#LENE 1:3 #1:9 2:10 7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 #8 82:8	16:9,9 20:22 36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	changes 96:24 98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	circulating 172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
bunch 232:6 business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	7,10,12,15 :15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :s 82:8	36:23 39:4,22 48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	98:11 154:1,6 208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	172:11 circumstances 42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :s 82:8	48:17 53:12 59:23 60:21 61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	208:8,10,12 209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
business 57:3,19 businesses 115:16 C C3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:15 18:3,19 :13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :s 82:8	61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	209:5 241:8 changing 210:21 characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	42:2 247:13 citation 192:14 citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
businesses 115:16 C C3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:13,14,18 :4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :8 82:8	61:4 62:4,15 64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
Total and the state of the stat	:4,17 28:16 :8 61:12 :9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :8 82:8	64:12 72:2 74:1,9,19 80:3 107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	characterizati 55:17 60:7 108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	citizen 8:10,20 9:9 10:15 citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
C 3:3 6:1 280:18 89 cabinet 124:2 94 calculation 133:14 10.2 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 15:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 795.2 70.2 70.2 70.2 70.2 70.2 70.2 70.2 70	:9 78:13 :2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	108:12,13 110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	citizens 91:9 158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
C 3:3 6:1 280:18 cabinet 124:2 calculation 133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	:2 91:6 :17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 :s 82:8	107:7 112:17 114:25 126:2,8 128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	110:16 111:11 113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	158:6 244:1 citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
cabinet 124:2 94 calculation 95 133:14 10 call 13:14 27:12 13 45:25 49:10,14 15 63:13,14 64:9 21 65:3 70:3 77:6 21 77:10,12 81:23 23 84:3 93:24 23 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 26 calling 64:22 160 calls 38:1 49:2 26 202:9 260:25 45 261:1 caus	:17,21,24 :25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	128:24 130:7 131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	113:20 256:24 characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	citizenship 8:21 91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
calculation 95 133:14 10 call 13:14 27:12 13 45:25 49:10,14 15 63:13,14 64:9 21 65:3 70:3 77:6 21 77:10,12 81:23 23 84:3 93:24 23 100:17 106:2 case 136:7,8 148:25 18 149:14 160:24 cate 168:9 189:12 Cath 248:15 249:22 Cath 250:11 251:21 cats called 7:10 27:1 cauc 49:3 93:12 cauc 115:3 139:22 26 145:9 155:9 24 216:9 249:24 73 calling 64:22 cauc 202:9 260:25 45 261:1 caus	:25 97:18 5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	131:9 139:21 141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	characterize 18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	91:6,15,21,23 92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
133:14 call 13:14 27:12 45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	5:17 125:12 6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 8\$ 82:8	141:8 170:19 171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	18:4 37:22 52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	92:1,24 city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
call 13:14 27:12	6:21 153:15 8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	171:15,22 172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	52:1 53:11 111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	city 115:8 145:8 146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
45:25 49:10,14 63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	8:4 161:10 1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	172:20 177:23 180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	111:6 characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	146:7 147:16 155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
63:13,14 64:9 65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	1:1 212:23 4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	180:24 190:21 205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	characterized 18:21 19:25 characterizes	155:10 238:4 240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
65:3 70:3 77:6 77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	4:19 226:20 0:3,21 7:17 248:10 •s 82:8	205:4 208:18 209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	18:21 19:25 characterizes	240:23 241:12 241:21 245:3
77:10,12 81:23 84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	0:3,21 7:17 248:10 • s 82:8	209:9 214:21 215:4 216:8,11	characterizes	241:21 245:3
84:3 93:24 100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	7:17 248:10 • s 82:8	215:4 216:8,11		
100:17 106:2 136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 case 18 cate 18 cate 18 cate 18 cate 11 cate 11 cats cauc 26 45: 26 44 cauc 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26	s 82:8		100.4	
136:7,8 148:25 149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1		217.0 218.17	109:4	248:22
149:14 160:24 168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 cate 11. Cate 11. Cate 12. Cath 12. Cath 13. Cauc 14. Cauc 14. Cauc 16. Cauc 16			charge 135:18	Civil 2:21
168:9 189:12 248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1	6:17 229:11	224:22 231:3	Charles 125:11	claim 48:22
248:15 249:22 250:11 251:21 called 7:10 27:1 49:3 93:12 115:3 139:22 145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 Cath cats Cauc cauc cauc cauc cauc cauc cauc cauc	gory 23:18	240:1 255:4	Chavez 115:3,5	118:10,12
250:11 251:21 cats Cauce 49:3 93:12 cauce 115:3 139:22 26:145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 cause 27:14 cauce 26:15 261:1 cats Cauce 27:15 cats	4:12	257:15 266:25	120:3,9 155:9	237:16
called 7:10 27:1 Cauc 49:3 93:12 26:11 115:3 139:22 26:12 145:9 155:9 44:12 216:9 249:24 73:16 calling 64:22 16:12 calls 38:1 49:2 26:22 202:9 260:25 45:22 261:1 cauc	nolic 52:12	267:10 271:11	156:2	CLARENCE 1:7
49:3 93:12 cauce 115:3 139:22 26:145:9 155:9 249:24 73:16:9 249:24 22 2015:38:1 49:2 26:211 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 cauce 202:9 260:25 261:1 cauce 202:9 260:25 261:1 cauce 202:9 260:25 261:1 cauce 26:25		272:8,12	check 77:16	clarification
115:3 139:22 26 145:9 155:9 44 216:9 249:24 73 calling 64:22 160 calls 38:1 49:2 26 92:2,11 146:22 26 202:9 260:25 45 261:1 caus	casian 148:3	certainty 144:23	132:14 160:18	8:13 47:18
145:9 155:9 216:9 249:24 calling 64:22 calls 38:1 49:2 92:2,11 146:22 202:9 260:25 261:1 44 73 cauc cauc	cus 26:20,21	certification	253:15	clarify 19:16
216:9 249:24 73 calling 64:22 16:0 calls 38:1 49:2 26:202:9 260:25 45:261:1 caus	:23 27:5	19:5	checked 32:4	73:1 100:21
calling 64:22 160 calls 38:1 49:2 cauc 92:2,11 146:22 26 202:9 260:25 45 261:1 cauc	:18,24 73:21	certified 22:5	checks 77:25	147:14
calls 38:1 49:2 cauc 92:2,11 146:22 26 202:9 260:25 45 261:1 cauc	:22 74:13,14 0:8 227:19	24:7 certify 17:9	Chemerinsky	class 76:20,20 76:22 77:1
92:2,11 146:22 26: 202:9 260:25 45: 261:1 caus	cuses 26:13	21:20 23:25	202:15 Chicago 111:23	113:22
202:9 260:25 45 261:1 caus	:17 43:25	280:5	148:14 249:23	classic 141:8
261:1 caus	:3 227:5	certifying 15:14	choice 92:23	142:8 242:13
	se 95:16	Cesar 115:3,5	109:13 215:13	244:4
candid 34:4 97:	:25 98:25	120:3 155:9	215:24 218:6	clause 186:15
	1:18	156:2	223:15 242:18	clear 9:6 40:2
	eat 40:2	chain 4:14,17,18	242:21 246:1	47:20 61:18
	8:18,18 48:1	4:19,23,25	choices 156:18	66:18 70:8
	5:2	83:15 166:10	156:19 182:17	79:14,16 82:3
	37:7 38:16	201:1 206:1,7	182:18	97:9 120:14
capable 78:2 42:		chair 18:16	choose 156:20	127:6,11 145:3
capacities 100:1 cc's	78:5	134:6	chop 150:22,24	152:2 246:25
	ELIA 1:6	challenge 127:1	chose 33:4	264:13 267:2
	sus 211:18	127:3,18	216:5	267:11 270:13
	1:20 212:2,2	129:19 239:19	chosen 92:24	clearly 45:16
		239:20	189:9,16	49:6 66:11
,	1:14,15,17	challenges	196:24	97:18 235:25
	ain 22:15	126:20,25	chron 166:8	CLEERMAN 1:7
<u> </u>	ain 22:15 :4 36:18	chamber 28:10	chronological	client 40:3
	ain 22:15 :4 36:18 :14 100:2	46:20	70:17,23	41:10 43:9
	ain 22:15 :4 36:18 :14 100:2 1:25 114:17		chronology	44:3,17,21,23
	ain 22:15 :4 36:18 :14 100:2 1:25 114:17 8:4 149:1,6	chambers 27:5	163:4	45:14,18 46:3
	ain 22:15 :4 36:18 :14 100:2 1:25 114:17 8:4 149:1,6 3:18 173:8	chambers 27:5 27:17		46:7,13,13,15
careful 21:17 24	ain 22:15 :4 36:18 :14 100:2 1:25 114:17 8:4 149:1,6	chambers 27:5	chuckle 85:7 189:8	46:15 160:24

186:9 239:11	188:13 243:4	137:10 139:5	components	105:10 217:25
clients 40:10,11	commission	139:20 141:13	274:7	248:21 251:1
40:12	282:10	141:20 144:2	compound 9:17	252:19 255:11
clip 137:12	committee	145:9,18 146:9	99:5 102:11	273:7,8,13,14
clipped 138:20	106:5 144:21	146:18,20,25	213:12	276:17,18
clipping 139:19	145:10,22	148:10,11,12	comprehensive	configurations
cloak 60:3,7	231:22 233:4	148:21,22	177:15	97:24,25
close 19:4 29:1	common 65:13	149:5 154:20	computer 153:3	140:15 199:7
32:21 54:21	73:25 178:8	156:9 197:4	computers	configured
closely 87:16	228:22	213:1 214:25	58:16 60:17,23	150:8 216:2
99:23	commonplace	215:11,12,16	61:20	245:23 248:23
closer 96:16,17	262:4	215:20,24	concentrated	269:16,19
clue 11:25 22:4	communicate	216:4 217:8	246:5	confined 121:21
58:11	23:10 54:6	218:4 237:19	concentrations	confirm 253:19
CLVS 6:3	276:1	238:10 239:18	269:15,17,25	confirmation
Coast 189:12	communicated	242:16,21	270:10,11	58:4
COCHRAN 1:7	203:7 254:22	249:3 251:9	concept 147:11	confirmed
code 40:21	communicating	252:14 255:16	concern 98:21	133:19 143:24
colleagues	16:7	256:20,22	120:12 177:24	confirms 185:24
153:17	communication	257:7,12 258:8	178:1 192:5	confuse 64:18
Colleen 3:13 7:2	23:20 24:22	258:21 270:9	237:8	confused 54:9
281:3	69:25 87:23	271:3 278:15	concerned 9:20	64:17 66:5
collegial 18:7	134:19 200:7	community's	11:6 63:19	198:1
Colon 99:21	274:8,12	120:6 137:7	64:4 98:11	confusion
100:15,17	277:10	company 200:7	103:6,22 112:3	268:17
215:3 271:15	communicati	200:8 203:19	114:16 128:21	Congratulations
color 150:18	13:2,22 17:11	compare 217:3	177:18 266:24	134:15
come 12:14 20:7	20:4,24 21:24	263:20	concerning 6:7	connect 130:1
25:4,8 49:12	22:10,22 23:2	compared	37:9	connection
62:22 77:3	23:5 24:2,15	217:12 270:10	concerns 96:5	146:21 224:14
79:12 86:21	35:5	compensated	104:13,24	244:15
90:1 93:7,22	communities	31:25	105:9 121:14	connections
93:25 102:22	114:10 148:15	complained	122:5 187:14	258:7,13
107:22 114:1	210:18	264:12	198:9,16,19	connote 65:10
133:20 164:21	community 8:11	complete 19:6	249:14	65:12
188:19 189:13	10:16,22 96:6	42:15 248:13	concluded 142:14 279:20	conscious
189:23 221:21 222:15 239:13	97:20,21,23 98:17 99:25	262:17 274:5		138:13 214:20 214:22 215:20
comes 43:20	100:9,12,14,20	275:2,6,15 277:7,23 278:2	conclusion 38:2 92:3	214.22 213.20
106:1 141:17	101:22 102:2	completed	conclusions	consequence
209:16 258:1	110:11,15,19	210:14 211:5	164:22	93:20 156:1
259:12	110:24,25	completely	conduct 60:2	244:21
coming 36:20	111:1,3,14,20	103:1	conducting	consequences
188:23 265:22	112:3,9,15,19	completion	72:24	155:22
commencing	112:19 113:2	32:14	confident 15:14	consider 92:8
3:1 280:8	113:13,14	complex 61:6,10	confidential	97:24 99:14
comment 76:9	114:5,11,13,13	compliance	65:2,8,12 72:8	174:10 199:1
121:16,18,22	114:20,23	224:10	72:16,22 73:6	203:18 231:10
121:25 122:1,3	118:1 119:21	complicated	186:8	247:1 269:13
122:8 127:8,12	121:14,24	89:21	confidentiality	270:7,19,25
127:13 131:10	122:5 123:9,11	complied 216:21	63:14 64:10,21	considerably
135:3 184:2	123:13 126:10	comply 224:4	66:17,20 67:2	88:24
	126:19 127:4	230:16 239:4	67:11,16 68:6	consideration
207:4 222:1,3		000 11	68:8,10 69:22	102:21
223:6,9,16	127:17 129:14	239:11		
223:6,9,16 267:11 273:7	129:18 131:7	complying	configuration	considered 47:8
223:6,9,16 267:11 273:7 278:13	129:18 131:7 134:8,15	complying 239:13	configuration 96:1 97:19	47:9 66:8
223:6,9,16 267:11 273:7 278:13 comments	129:18 131:7 134:8,15 135:12,20	complying 239:13 component	configuration 96:1 97:19 98:22 102:15	47:9 66:8 88:24 104:15
223:6,9,16 267:11 273:7 278:13	129:18 131:7 134:8,15	complying 239:13	configuration 96:1 97:19	47:9 66:8

				Page 288
269:9,11	160:3 196:5	61:14 164:1	83:7,18 85:8	23:12 72:4
considering	249:18 257:21	187:10 253:4,6	88:15 89:24	corresponded
267:1	contacting	conversational	90:15 91:1,13	17:3
consistent	106:16 112:15	18:8	91:16,22 92:10	costs 31:23,23
39:23 139:18	contacts 15:25	conversations	95:17 97:5,6	counsel 2:1,15
consistently	16:3 17:13	91:5 94:8,19	98:1 99:1	6:19 28:21
93:5 238:5	74:24 93:19	107:19 112:21	100:9,10,13	45:8 47:3
271:9	95:6 100:2,3,8	112:25 265:18	103:8 108:10	50:18 51:4
conspiracy	100:11 113:10	265:21 266:1	110:1 112:10	108:25 182:25
33:20 227:4	196:3	convincing	117:5,7,14,15	202:5 213:2
constituted	contain 16:15	246:7	118:2 119:22	229:10 243:14
10:22	70:24 96:23	cooperative	121:4,10 122:8	247:3 248:1
constitution	contained 20:19	18:22	123:2 127:20	265:6,12
192:6	85:24 106:4	coordinate	127:23 128:9	268:16 274:19
constitutional	179:14	126:12 130:18	129:11,19	Counsel's
77:2 84:14,16	Containing	134:16 135:4	131:12 134:20	236:18
constrain 18:13	96:15	coordinating	135:23 136:16	counties 249:4
19:12,13 110:3	content 126:15	135:19	137:1,2,19	country 250:6
111:17	159:3	copied 17:20	139:2,5,16	county 25:18
constrained	contentious	23:4 24:22	140:21 141:21	146:3,7 174:5
96:2,7 98:22	49:25	39:3,7 41:16	142:23 144:22	249:5 280:2
construction	contentiousn	51:22 171:2,13	145:10,19	couple 103:24
211:22	50:2	232:7	147:24 148:7	144:19 187:7
consult 71:17	context 19:3	copies 14:19	148:17 150:22	264:4
110:11,15	21:25 44:1	62:23 139:1	150:25 151:4	course 24:24
111:2 114:4	65:18,22,22	220:11	151:16,17,25	57:2,18 65:17
157:1 166:16	76:24 84:23	copy 14:13,17	152:5,7,17	72:9 87:19
166:22 167:19	110:22 117:2	28:13 29:9	159:10,11	112:16 115:11
174:15	121:2 124:7	41:20 42:6,11	163:9,13,19	118:17,20
consultant	141:6 159:4	42:13 68:17	168:23 170:4	170:24 195:21
172:5 186:17	211:24 242:25	116:11 131:15	171:9,12 173:5	206:3,8 214:1
203:8	Contextually	131:18 132:7	173:11,16	214:4 222:22
consultants 173:15	173:11 continue 20:9	205:25 219:15	176:5 179:14 185:25 186:3	249:9,15 court 1:1 6:11
consultation	125:7 215:21	219:22,23,25 220:24 232:4,5	188:9 191:6,6	6:17 7:8 11:18
111:19	continued 1:17	253:22	191:24 193:22	15:15 17:9
consulted 52:2	210:15 234:11	core 41:9 153:5	194:8 197:11	18:22 21:21,22
59:8 98:18,20	234:18 235:7	Corporation	197:12,17	23:25 24:17
262:16	243:20	167:24	199:21,22	67:17,19 81:22
consulting	continues 50:16	correct 7:17,21	205:13 213:23	97:7 122:15
112:8 174:9	169:13 235:15	9:11 10:12	213:24,25	126:10 128:16
198:23 204:21	235:15 236:8	11:15 12:4	214:3 221:5,9	129:15 158:21
219:3 231:8	continuing	16:16 17:12	224:12 229:11	170:18 175:6
contact 17:17	192:11	21:14 28:3,7	240:21 243:2	179:4,6 184:19
62:13,15 97:22	contract 35:11	33:19 35:12	243:19 244:13	193:15 205:24
99:15 101:16	35:14,19 36:4	37:15,16,17	244:14 245:14	214:23 229:2
101:18,22,25	36:4,5,7,10	38:16,19 39:1	255:21 256:5	239:19,19
102:14,20	39:11 42:18,18	40:4,11,13	265:18,23	244:24 245:21
114:18 122:18	160:6	42:7 43:14	266:1 269:12	246:7,16,25
131:1 133:10	contractual 61:8	44:18,25 45:20	270:1 271:18	247:2,8 248:7
136:18,19	contrast 221:24	46:9,13,16,24	273:15 275:24	265:2,11 267:4
146:9 169:25	222:18	50:5,6 55:17	276:4,7 277:12	267:9 278:16
172:17 196:7	controlled 60:19	56:6,10 67:12	277:19 281:20	280:14
contacted 102:2	controversy	67:18 70:14	correcting 108:3	courtroom
103:5,20 104:5	61:11	74:13 76:18,18	correctly 46:7	126:20
106:10,14	convenient	77:4 78:21,25	103:12 130:9	Court's 267:3
107:1 113:12	230:8	79:3,24 80:9	179:21	Court-drawn
144:5,11,18	conversation	81:14 82:5,23	correspond	218:16

cover 183:18	206:19 251:18	167:15 176:17	54:1 55:1	68:23,23 87:12
covered 137:17	275:21	190:7 194:22	declaration	90:3,9 95:10
162:3,5,10,13	dated 37:17	254:12 259:14	225:22	109:3 113:18
covers 128:13	78:20 81:13	277:12 280:8		116:8 138:4,6
co-counsel	85:5 86:5	282:8	declarations 226:12	162:22 178:19
46:22,23 47:3	117:4 159:6	days 31:19	dedicated 84:13	179:1 191:17
47:8,9 82:8	166:11 171:8	75:14 190:7	defend 108:9,16	230:21 247:11
co-leader 100:7	175:22 179:13	201:5 276:9,10	108:17,21	247:12 248:8
create 80:24	193:22 200:25	day-to-day	109:12 260:15	272:23 279:17
154:19 211:18	221:8 274:4	51:15 59:23	Defendants 2:3	279:19 280:5
212:3 215:25	282:8	de 2:8 3:9 6:12	2:16 3:14,18	280:12 281:21
243:5 267:25	dates 31:7 70:25	6:21 139:7,22	6:10,15 7:1	depositions
created 190:12	179:21 185:17	140:9 144:6,11	280:17 281:4,8	150:3
211:6,6 235:8	189:16,22	240:20 241:14	defended 260:24	DEPOSTION
242:12	190:18 201:20	242:8 257:24	defense 219:10	1:18
creating 211:17	DAUGHERTY	280:24	250:4	deputy 88:21
216:22 272:11	3:21 281:11	deal 51:7 74:8	defer 89:19	derive 134:4
criteria 81:21	daughter 200:21	133:4 172:22	181:18	descent 100:22
91:16,17 92:21	Daughtery 7:4,5	208:5 209:25	deferential	describe 47:11
93:3 114:17	8:12 9:12,17	244:23	210:25	51:18 84:23
269:10	11:19 12:5	dealing 53:7	define 15:21	178:6
criterion 82:1	14:5,18 19:16	66:3 213:10	defined 62:11	described 13:20
critical 102:10	28:13 42:21	262:3	DEININGER	22:3 35:10
criticizing	47:20 55:7,11	dealings 44:5	1:14 2:13	39:5 51:24
117:24	57:24 58:9	deals 65:14	delayed 68:14	113:25 153:25
Crosse 64:5	60:6 65:20	209:4	delineate	207:17 208:1
114:14	67:19,24 68:18	dealt 44:7	210:11	describes
cross-examin	69:21 70:1,12	130:21 136:2,2	Democrat 63:23	140:10
226:13 266:8	73:1,4 78:8,14	dean 202:15	237:22 238:5	description
culminate	99:4 100:21	debate 43:24	Democratic	176:18 177:16
278:13	103:16 104:3	decade 215:2	237:20,23,25	187:4
culminating	109:8 111:24	decades 44:5	Democrats 45:7	descriptions
278:23	120:17,20	50:1	118:25 224:20	178:2
cultural 146:24	132:7,20,23	December 159:1	225:2,6 226:23	descriptor 31:13
147:11 152:15	133:11 142:25	159:6,14	228:2,9,13	34:17
152:16	147:1 157:16	decennial	229:1 230:22	descriptors 31:9
curious 43:8	166:4 170:11	113:25	231:11 238:1	designated
64:22 158:7	175:1 181:9	decide 13:11	demographic	10:11 48:24
currently 150:8	183:16 187:21	251:7	152:8 251:14	designation
customarily 91:20	203:3 219:17	decided 49:9	demographica	49:6 214:10
	240:7 253:14	54:15 75:7,17	148:24	designed 75:3,5
cycle 8:1 44:10 72:19 227:18	253:20,25 254:3 264:13	decision 33:8 34:20 50:4	demonstrate 222:1 223:6,9	desire 34:4
245:21 262:14	264:19 265:9	51:11 52:14,16	demonstrated	desires 120:7
cycles 45:4	265:14 266:9	53:10,17,18	143:15	despite 33:20 55:18
Cycles TO.T	267:2,19 268:8	54:23 55:10	deny 127:21	destroyed
	270:13 273:25	56:3,8,9 58:14	DEPARTMENT	143:18
D 2:4 4:1 6:1	275:1 277:1,16	59:3,13 60:1,2	3:15 281:5	detail 12:15
daily 31:18	279:10,13	61:24 71:11,21	depends 96:14	140:11 176:20
50:15 51:20	DAVID 1:14 2:13	72:1,5 77:3,5,8	deponent 3:22	212:4
Dan 90:16	DAVIS 1:4	82:11,16 93:20	3:25 235:23	deterioration
darker 150:20	day 3:1 51:24	108:4,9 196:12	257:1 281:12	36:19
dash 187:1,1	78:24 80:19	197:8,14,16	281:15,16	determination
data 251:14	82:20 85:10	248:15	deposed 93:11	196:15
date 11:4 77:15	86:18 93:21	decisions 51:15	261:5	determine 19:4
77:18 105:16	115:19 131:11	51:20 52:2,3,5	deposition 2:19	71:18 92:21
105:18 159:5	136:13 138:19	54:4 59:17,18	6:5 7:15 9:23	173:25 174:10
192:1 201:23	140:21 141:18	decision-maki	37:3 41:4	252:13

	I	I	Ī	1
determines	111:7	210:2	218:2,2,10,15	15:16 20:18
186:9	disagreement	disenfranchis	218:23 219:2	21:23 22:9,17
determining	268:17	68:13 192:4,24	223:2 233:2	37:5 47:21
90:21	discern 225:23	193:3	234:6,7,12	77:23 136:17
detriment 217:8	disclosed 248:6	disfranchisem	237:20,21,23	158:23 161:1
Deuren 3:11	248:14	192:8	238:1,3 241:13	162:20,21
37:15,24 281:1	disclosing	disk 87:11	243:6 245:20	165:19 170:6
developed 92:20	263:21	178:14,18,25	251:1,7,8	174:25 176:4
development	disclosure 24:17	268:22 272:17	255:10,10,20	179:5 183:8
160:24	248:14	272:22	256:5 269:16	184:19,22
devise 99:6	discovery 11:23	displaced 154:8	269:18,24,25	187:18 191:15
dialogue 87:18	12:1,9 18:3,18	displayed	270:1,21 271:9	193:16,18
difference 65:5	19:6,11	190:11	271:17,22	195:19 200:11
65:7,9,9 79:11	discriminate	dispute 91:3	273:7,8,12	201:3,21
156:22 203:13	212:25 238:10	104:11,22	280:14,14	208:15 221:4
218:22	239:17	105:8 110:12	districting	236:1,6 237:5
different 47:2	discriminates	112:6,10,13	224:5	264:9,16 265:3
48:20,21	237:18	245:13,16	districts 9:11	265:5 266:16
109:16 111:23	discuss 8:6	dissent 259:17	10:5,7,10,10	274:5,21,23
112:2 114:7,12	10:25 11:12	distinct 191:11	10:16,23 11:2	275:2
124:22 151:14	25:13 58:23	distinction	11:7,10 80:25	documents
151:21 155:5	64:13 67:1,5	47:15,19 61:18	93:4,8 98:14	11:14,17,22
169:10 197:3	72:20,23 73:10	68:9,12 204:22	102:16 104:15	13:6,9,11 15:7
198:14,25	118:7 207:10	distinctly 35:21	105:1 119:22	15:8,10,25
206:1 213:13	209:11	distinguish	121:4 122:2,7	16:2,5,11,14
238:6 244:10	discussed 9:8	204:19 206:11	140:7,15 141:6	16:14,19 17:3
differential	10:14,24 26:7	distribute	144:3 150:8,9	17:10 18:21,23
269:13	54:4 67:4	137:13	150:16 154:3	19:10 20:18
differentials	90:12 94:3	distributed	174:1 195:9,17	22:21 24:1,14
270:7,20	110:23 112:23	137:18	195:25 196:1	25:2,6,10 35:8
differently	120:3 195:8	district 1:1,1	196:13,19,24	56:18,19 64:11
156:21	278:20	6:11,12,17,17	205:1 206:18	132:17 136:23
difficult 18:20	discussing 8:24	15:14 21:21,22	207:2,8 210:14	162:3 166:1
74:2,3 94:1	15:1 37:12	50:21 63:19	211:6 212:3,21	170:2 265:7
147:13 201:2	64:1 195:13	90:15,22 92:22	213:1,5,23	267:4 278:12
246:6 254:13	209:7	93:8 95:17	214:6 216:10	dog 155:15,16
dilutes 119:20	discussion	96:3,8,9,19	216:23 218:14	155:16
direct 20:24 23:2,20 26:11	10:19 14:9 35:21 65:24	98:23 99:1 104:7 118:10	218:23 219:1,4 221:22 222:9	doing 31:14
29:17 40:22	67:7 116:20	118:14,20	222:10,16,25	33:11,18,25 62:18 71:14
62:13 111:19	167:3 178:21	120:12 122:4	223:4,25	126:17 134:24
169:25 188:12	206:25 209:10	134:10 142:12	233:13 242:9	154:3 159:23
192:13 206:6	212:1 220:17	142:15,20	243:1,18	177:21 182:11
221:3 226:11	272:20	143:11,16	244:10,16,19	183:23 193:1
directed 191:21	discussions 8:19	144:1 149:13	245:6,14,19,23	194:17 198:24
243:4	13:23 14:10	150:19 153:6	246:2,8,19	198:25 199:3
directions 149:6	15:3 25:20	153:17 154:22	248:21,22,24	209:20
directive 142:16	44:9 53:4 59:1	155:8 156:7,10	250:2,13	dominates
143:6	64:2 67:10	156:13,15	252:14 257:5	117:16
directly 16:22	71:25 73:6,20	157:3,8 211:19	262:16 270:8	Don 7:5 35:3
29:16 36:10	74:9,12,13,15	212:20,20	272:11	166:1 170:7
167:13 182:24	74:20 91:11	213:6,9,17,20	divergence	265:13
191:5 219:3	94:15,23	214:17,18,24	49:23	DONALD 3:21
246:16 248:25	109:23 110:18	215:6,8,23	divergent 49:9	281:11
257:12	115:11,22	216:1,7,9,12	49:13,15	door 148:16
Director 2:1,14	122:13,15	216:13,14	divided 120:13	doubt 42:9
disagree 34:7	195:24 207:9	217:3,4,8,12	dividing 119:21	77:20 78:4
95:23 97:3	207:12,14	217:13,17,19	document 4:16	165:17 182:17

204:9	245:20	146:12,17	230:1,14 239:3	230:2,12
Doug 6:24	drew 151:9	147:7 149:16	240:10 245:21	effort 34:9 89:8
157:19 158:3	269:23	149:23 150:1,4	256:3 262:1	122:4 137:7
175:9	dribbled 18:3	151:8 157:13	269:7 278:10	146:8 155:25
DOUGLAS 3:5	drinks 107:23	161:22 173:4	earliest 218:4	efforts 7:21
280:20	189:23	184:1,4 200:6	early 27:11	91:21 203:16
Dow 187:21,22	Drive 115:3,5	202:21,25	43:19 51:2	211:4 244:24
265:7	120:3,9 155:9	213:7,12 214:7	73:18 98:3	eight 119:5
Dr 168:15	156:3	216:24 218:19	107:20 108:1	273:17
169:14,17,19	drop 276:16	219:21,25	110:18 113:8	either 27:12
169:23 172:18	Dudek 3:19 7:5	220:2,7,12	139:15,17	36:2 60:18
188:23 189:1	281:9	222:11 225:1	159:17 165:21	189:18 214:3
199:24 201:12	due 31:21	225:13,24	182:23 189:18	251:19 253:9
201:14 202:2	172:25	226:3 227:10	190:13,15,16	elect 92:22
203:7 205:5,15	DUFFY 2:5	229:6,12,24	193:20 198:1,9	154:21 215:12
250:10 265:18	duly 7:12	230:10 231:5	199:6 249:24	215:23 218:5
265:20,22	dynamic 258:9	231:16 233:14	easier 36:14	223:14 242:18
266:2 268:14	uy 11411110 200.9	235:4,13,18,21	230:2	242:20,21
draft 176:5	E	236:21 237:12	easily 21:6	245:25
209:1 254:20	E 2:4 3:3,3,13	238:13 239:1	east 3:19 155:3	elected 26:3,6
263:2	4:1,8 6:1,1	239:21 240:4	174:5 273:13	93:5 221:23
drafted 172:1,15	280:18,18	240:10 241:17	281:9	222:16 241:3
186:18 226:25	281:3	241:23 243:8	eastern 1:1 6:11	271:10
254:17 262:24	Earle 3:7,9 4:3,7	243:12 245:9	6:17 21:22	election 7:18
drafting 172:8	5:3 6:21,22	246:23 247:24	151:2,3 271:21	74:12 76:20
186:11 209:15	7:14 8:15,18	248:3,13 249:8	280:14	113:19 271:6
209:15,16,18	9:15,18,22	250:15 252:15	east-west	271:14
209:22 210:1,3	10:1 11:21	252:24 253:24	273:14 276:17	elections 73:18
211:1	12:13 14:13,16	254:2 256:1,13	276:19	238:6,6 271:7
drafts 176:13	14:22 19:1,2	256:23 258:16	easy 64:17 74:4	electronically
dramatic 96:21	19:20,23 28:15	258:23 259:2,9	ECKSTEIN 1:4	23:12
dramatic 96:21 153:12 217:15	19:20,23 28:15 38:5,8,11 43:7	258:23 259:2,9 259:21,23	ECKSTEIN 1:4 editorial 121:16	23:12 element 173:23
	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15		editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22	
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19	38:5,8,11 43:7	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5	element 173:23
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2 drawn 81:22	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1 116:12,17,24	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6 167:5 173:4	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9 105:21 106:7	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment 169:21 172:19
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2 drawn 81:22 96:3 151:13,15	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1 116:12,17,24 120:18,21	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6 167:5 173:4 176:25 189:6	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9 105:21 106:7 153:25 198:14	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment 169:21 172:19 emphasize
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2 drawn 81:22 96:3 151:13,15 151:16 213:18	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1 116:12,17,24 120:18,21 127:3,10 128:8	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6 167:5 173:4 176:25 189:6 190:21 193:24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9 105:21 106:7 153:25 198:14 efficiency 230:1	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment 169:21 172:19 emphasize 182:18
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2 drawn 81:22 96:3 151:13,15 151:16 213:18 213:21 214:24	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1 116:12,17,24 120:18,21 127:3,10 128:8 132:9,12,24	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6 167:5 173:4 176:25 189:6 190:21 193:24 196:2 207:17	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9 105:21 106:7 153:25 198:14 efficiency 230:1 efficient 35:25	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment 169:21 172:19 emphasize 182:18 enclosed 185:10
153:12 217:15 dramatically 223:13 245:19 draw 71:20 83:8 83:10 90:22 118:13 119:10 122:6 151:10 151:12 161:11 174:12 179:9 194:24 224:1 227:20 229:19 239:5 246:8 272:15 273:6 drawers 212:24 238:9 drawing 95:14 151:14 153:1 153:17 155:6 204:23 213:5 214:6 226:23 245:22 262:22 273:2 drawn 81:22 96:3 151:13,15 151:16 213:18	38:5,8,11 43:7 47:14 48:7,15 53:22 54:8 55:24 58:6,13 60:12 65:23 66:2 67:21 68:1,7,12,24 69:3,19,24 70:3,7,13 71:10 73:3,9 78:10,17 79:6 79:9,22 80:17 81:8,12 83:14 85:4 87:6,14 92:6,16 99:6 99:11 101:1,4 103:3 104:1,10 105:5,7 107:5 107:13 108:13 108:19 109:2,7 109:9,22 111:16 112:1 116:12,17,24 120:18,21 127:3,10 128:8	259:21,23 260:11,16,21 261:1,5,9,24 263:6,12,18 264:2 268:24 269:1,4,21,22 270:6,15,18,24 272:1,4 273:1 273:19,22 274:2,12,15,22 275:10 277:9 277:17 278:22 279:6,12 280:22,24 Earle's 176:24 earlier 20:23 25:11 47:4 83:9,25 88:2 91:4,10 133:8 142:22 152:4 153:25 159:22 161:21 165:6 167:5 173:4 176:25 189:6 190:21 193:24	editorial 121:16 effect 33:9,22 42:20 54:5 95:16 96:17,20 97:20 98:1,12 98:25 102:23 103:7,22 104:16 105:2 105:12 186:16 198:14 245:3 252:23 260:7 276:24 effective 10:22 11:1,9 134:14 136:1,6,9,10 182:15 244:9 251:8 252:13 255:16 effectively 109:17 118:1 241:2 effects 104:9 105:21 106:7 153:25 198:14 efficiency 230:1	element 173:23 elements 97:20 97:23 elicit 250:25 eligibility 92:8 eligible 90:14,23 91:5,8,12,12 Elisa 133:24 196:7 249:23 250:21 274:18 275:22 Elise 255:3 Elmwood 3:23 281:13 else's 115:19 224:7 ELVIRA 1:3 embarrass 172:20 embarrassing 202:12 embarrassment 169:21 172:19 emphasize 182:18

				1 450 272
38:19 39:17	168:3 172:11	71:1 86:15,24	188:2 191:16	explained 22:6
42:12 47:22	206:13,14	96:13 113:2	191:19 193:12	47:4 83:9
encompass	253:9	132:13 133:13	193:16 200:12	93:18 152:14
216:13	ERICA 2:9	136:8 183:24	200:19 205:21	230:14 239:3
encouraged	Eric's 88:8	201:2 242:10	205:25 219:15	261:25
111:12 146:19	error 125:8	276:5	220:24 221:3	explaining 45:1
ended 32:14	Esenberg 75:25	examination 4:2	232:15 240:6	explanation
109:17 153:5	76:1,5 77:10	7:13 111:18,18	242:5 253:11	97:10
endorse 125:3	77:20 78:5,23	111:19 158:1	264:8,23 265:3	explicit 121:17
277:19	79:20 81:14,17	202:25 212:13	266:8 267:17	222:24
ends 87:15	82:7,13,18,21	247:14 264:22	267:18 273:2,4	express 204:25
178:18 272:17	83:17 84:2,10	269:3 281:17	273:19,20	expressed 165:6
279:16	85:12 86:4,20	examined 7:12	274:14,15	expressing
engaged 171:15	113:23	example 26:12	277:13,15,16	208:23
engagement	Esenberg's 79:2	43:2 44:3,8,11	exhibits 5:1	extent 7:25
4:11 34:6	especially 96:21	45:7 73:21	132:4 220:8	114:18 126:24
37:10,11,13,23	essence 111:4	176:18 225:21	existed 260:23	147:1 157:1
38:4,21 161:5	essentially 34:6	271:8 278:4	existing 150:10	206:8
183:10 185:6	150:22 182:25	examples 180:8	expand 235:21	extraordinarily
185:10,24	204:12 208:17	exceed 34:9	expect 42:1 50:2	63:18 98:2
186:12	245:17	exception	217:11	extraordinary
English 79:10	established	233:19 243:12	expectation	129:24
enjoyed 203:19	142:22 161:4	exchanged	58:2 162:12	extremely 74:3
enjoying 94:4	235:25	167:11 202:9	251:5	82:7 100:1
enormous 55:19	et 6:8,9,13,15	exclamation	expected 66:19	123:14
55:22 65:7,8,8	280:15,17	125:4	$\bar{7}1:19$	e-mail 4:12,13
243:25	ethical 46:5	exclusive 17:5	expecting	4:14,15,17,18
ensure 218:25	267:1,7,8	Excuse 178:13	157:20 179:16	4:19,20,21,22
enter 29:11	ethics 40:21	268:21 274:10	201:6	4:23,25 12:19
61:15 62:1	ethnic 147:17	executive 25:18	expensive 34:13	12:24 23:21
entered 13:21	147:18,22,23	exhaustive	experience	27:22 59:5
30:6,7 36:6	ethnicities	214:21	32:23 49:6	77:13,19 78:4
entire 64:14	148:4,4	exhibit 4:9,24	57:13,14,16	78:18,20 80:18
198:13 199:11	European 148:4	14:20,23 20:2	114:3	81:1,13 82:3
199:13 209:19	evaluate 156:1	20:12 21:12,13	experienced	82:12 83:3,4
232:2 236:18	EVANJELINA	28:12,16 37:2	7:18,24 8:1	83:10,15,17,18
251:15 259:6	1:7	38:9,12 47:15	18:6 66:3	84:1,2 85:5,19
261:20 262:15	evening 94:4	47:18,19 48:4	88:10,11	85:19,24 86:4
entirely 62:17	212:15,16	69:5,12,16	113:19	86:7,11 87:24
entities 213:13	event 13:16	70:9,17 77:14	expert 92:12,12	116:9 117:2
entitled 69:22	264:15 275:3	78:12,15 81:10	152:22 178:4	120:1 124:23
92:25 248:10	events 30:4	81:13 83:12	186:14,16	125:1 126:22
entity 231:7	eventual 172:13	85:2 116:7,7,8	203:8 204:20	131:23 133:16 134:3 138:25
environmenta	eventually 33:4	119:14 124:15	204:21 209:16	
138:13	158:9,10	124:19 125:20	209:18 211:2	140:20,23
equal 192:12 equalize 153:16	216:14 252:7 everybody 26:5	131:25 138:3 145:12 146:1	247:17,18,19 261:4 265:23	141:20 142:3 143:12 144:24
Eric 13:17 16:3	60:20 64:4	149:25 150:2,5	expertise 191:8	145:2 163:7,8
16:7 19:25	67:22 119:3	158:16,17,21	expertise 191.8 experts 178:6	163:15 164:4,7
24:3,16 25:4,8	156:16 266:24	159:8 161:2,12	223:21,23	164:24 166:9
48:24 49:21	evidence 226:8	162:22,23,23	224:2,3,14,17	166:10,10
51:16 62:18	226:10	170:15,19	224:20 225:5,9	167:3,13 168:4
67:1 75:17,21	evident 47:16	175:3,7,19	225:16,23	171:8 175:20
75:22,22 78:6	47:19	178:22 179:5	260:2	175:21,24,25
88:7,15,24	evolved 262:12	183:9 184:13	expires 282:10	176:3,15
89:3,4,9,19	exact 61:4 159:4	184:17,20,22	explain 43:15	179:10 181:14
90:12 117:4	190:17	185:1,6,14,21	93:25 179:24	181:15 183:18
139:1 167:22	exactly 22:3	186:21 187:23	226:2	188:8,15 189:7

				Page 293
196:11 200:24	54:22 76:9	feel 172:21	15:5 24:6	focused 141:19
201:1 205:18	89:3,11 102:18	218:22	63:13 64:9	focusing 111:21
206:12 208:15	105:5 119:23	fellow 180:16	67:7,10 70:17	201:3
208:25 221:5	121:5 160:23	felon 91:18	75:21 77:22	folder 220:4
221:15,17	161:25 168:17	felt 96:4	84:6,9 96:25	folks 54:22
223:2,5 254:5	173:10,12	Fielkow 3:14 7:2	99:14 102:14	148:5,6 153:2
254:17 257:13	187:14 218:14	281:4	102:20 104:5	262:5 274:8
258:2,6 274:4	256:10	fight 244:15	106:9,14	275:6
274:9,16,17,23	fairly 21:4 33:12	figure 52:5 95:5	113:11 122:17	follow 95:21
276:6,11,13	73:25 149:6	122:17 123:18	124:13 128:16	104:18 267:23
277:5 278:4,23	257:12	124:13 163:18	128:23 130:20	followed 239:6
e-mails 11:12	fairness 41:14	254:9,13	130:20 134:22	following 30:24
12:3,8 26:19	41:14	274:20	135:10 144:14	65:24 90:5,11
27:19 33:21	faith 61:15	figured 87:3	144:19 161:12	95:12 263:16
47:25 78:19	67:23	file 244:24	161:15 166:10	follows 7:12
79:19 82:17	fall 18:8 23:18	filed 140:6	168:10 169:4,7	103:18 104:21
86:9 96:12	50:17,19	files 20:11,13,17	170:9,21,21	220:22
122:19,23	familiar 8:3	21:7 22:5	176:2 185:9,20	follow-up 37:9
164:25 179:7	82:13 147:5,21	final 49:10	185:22,23	212:19
190:17 200:20	205:1 226:14	98:10 151:20	188:15 189:1	Foltz 57:4 58:15
202:8 206:1,1	231:7 232:21	196:12,14,23	194:21,24	58:19,23 61:21
206:7 248:17	251:16	197:2,6 259:8	198:2 200:14	71:12 78:6,11
254:8,13,15	familiarity	finally 103:15	200:23 202:2	78:11 117:3
260:7 261:14	262:22	188:16 199:23	207:19 222:5	138:20,25
266:1 275:15	familiarize	240:19 241:1	232:24 233:11	171:12 174:15
277:21,23	170:22	find 22:6 52:10	242:5 247:11	188:13 194:1
278:13	family 148:14	175:16 183:20	249:20,22	207:11 276:12
e-mail's 141:22	189:15	185:10	250:22 254:24	football 112:2
	fans 112:4	finders 97:17	257:10 258:1	foregoing
F	far 12:23 34:9	fine 9:24 18:5	264:4 266:7	281:19
F 2:4	59:22 74:14	20:7 36:15	267:16,16,18	forgive 129:20
faced 245:17,22	95:14 97:19	41:6 48:5 69:1	276:6	form 9:12,16
facilitating	247:13 278:1	109:15 111:6	fishing 123:16	10:2 60:6
127:14,15	farm 174:4	113:21 127:5	123:18	65:20 90:16,24
facility 230:3	fast 117:25	128:5 132:23	Fitzgerald 16:20	213:8 214:14
fact 40:6 42:4	father 201:4	170:12,12	16:22 17:11,18	221:12,18
50:17 76:22	fault 104:19	175:1 253:21	20:5,25 21:1	226:18 227:8
97:18 117:18	favor 126:13	268:3,6	21:10,24 23:17	227:22 228:5
117:20 128:11	130:19 131:6	finish 166:16,22	24:12,12 38:24	228:18 229:4
130:23 131:14	276:17	211:17 233:9	39:1 40:8,9	229:12,22,24
138:18 146:8	featured 169:9	finishing 19:1	43:12,13 44:22	230:9,24
149:1 153:10	February 1:20	firm 7:3 32:22	72:23,24 161:8	231:14 233:22
177:12 184:5	3:1 6:6 30:5	35:1,3,11,15	163:12,16	234:8,16,22
196:21 208:14	37:17 50:20	35:19 36:9	186:24 187:1	235:3,12,13
215:20 224:9	87:12 90:8	38:22 39:12,14	Fitzgeralds	236:12 238:25
247:19 261:14	95:10 158:13	40:3,20,23,25	53:19	239:22 241:15
262:6 276:21	159:18 160:20	41:10 42:19	Fitzgerald's 17:1	241:17,23
factor 154:5,25	175:23,23,25	44:23 46:22,22	five 235:22	243:7 245:9
218:11	178:20 179:1	46:23 47:6	fix 200:15	246:10,22
factors 154:15	185:7,11	52:16 57:11	201:22	249:7 250:15
154:15,23,25	272:19,23	61:22 62:1	fixing 201:20	256:1,13
155:5 217:22	279:17 280:8	71:22 72:6,13	flexibility 95:14	260:11 261:24
269:11 270:19	282:8	93:10 94:16	102:22	263:6 269:20
facts 61:7,11	federal 2:21	182:5 183:3	flip 208:14	270:12
153:14	65:14 224:4	200:22	flower 70:4	formal 18:10,10
failing 243:13	225:18 245:21	firms 39:20	focus 62:5	82:14 171:20
fair 40:14,17,18	feedback 205:5	46:18	119:13 200:23	203:21 204:13
42:16 50:3	205:15	first 7:11 8:23	216:11 262:8	205:4,4

format 31:5	friends 32:21	gathering	59:20,22 68:18	135:11 147:14
formed 144:21	183:5	207:19	71:17 77:1	149:18 152:10
145:9	friendship	general 2:1,14	81:5 87:6	156:15,16
former 55:23	169:11	3:16 88:22	116:15 125:15	160:4 162:20
88:21 118:4	front 22:19	191:12 281:6	130:10,12	162:24 165:17
225:13 241:6	30:13 153:8	generally 49:1	131:23 133:2	166:17 167:3
forth 33:3 35:5	161:2 171:20	93:1 106:14	143:1 147:2	170:9,20
82:17 114:4	183:10,18	177:20 193:8	149:17 155:5	171:23 175:14
forthright 18:23	269:5	207:14,16	155:14 157:17	178:5,6,10
forward 29:23	Frontera 2:8	213:6	157:20 161:24	179:22 182:15
47:13 56:17	3:10 6:13,22	general's 75:18	162:16 166:22	182:18 184:19
59:20 63:9	139:8,23	94:20	175:1 178:15	185:19 194:20
71:17 73:7	140:10 144:6	generate 11:8	178:16 181:14	199:23 204:3
77:1 96:16	144:11 240:20	generated 12:3	183:5,20	208:10,13
118:5 160:2	241:14 242:8	12:5	198:18 200:16	209:23 212:8
201:4,11	257:24 280:25	gentleman	200:17 203:3	213:7 214:7,19
263:24 278:6	frustrating	226:14	205:19 207:18	216:24 218:19
found 56:5	18:19	geographic	208:2,7 211:11	219:14 220:12
66:25	full 281:19	191:9	212:6 214:11	220:15,23
foundation	full-blown 269:8	geography	215:5 220:13	220:13,23
42:23 57:25	function 85:18	146:24 147:11	226:10 231:2	225:24 233:14
102:25 111:9	85:21 138:19	152:15,16	231:18 233:8	235:18 238:13
144:19 213:15	fund 126:9,19	GERALD 1:14	237:16 239:25	239:21 246:21
214:8 225:3	129:14,22,25	2:13	246:12 252:18	248:9 252:15
227:23 228:6,8	130:5 219:10	getting 51:13	261:13 263:8	252:24 253:15
228:19 238:16	250:4 278:15	62:22 97:13	263:22,24	256:23 259:9
238:25 260:22	fundamentals	108:2 110:24	264:3,6,6	260:21 261:9
260:23 270:3	48:16	120:19 183:12	274:1 275:4,19	266:9 268:9,11
270:22 277:14	funding 127:17	201:7 204:12	276:6 278:6	272:15 275:11
279:3	129:17	205:7 262:19	goal 216:17	276:16 277:18
four 86:9 272:22	funds 34:22	give 49:17 69:9	GODFEY 3:4	278:6
frame 99:14	funnel 101:2	77:18 81:23,23	280:19	Gonzalez 101:13
160:21	further 25:5	83:22 88:5	Godfrey 2:24	101:14
framed 102:9	263:25 276:2	99:13 113:4	280:6	good 7:16 41:23
framework 89:1	future 152:10	116:10 138:8	goes 44:5 148:9	50:7 61:15
frankly 262:4		162:25 175:7	155:17 208:25	67:22 71:8
free 82:8 84:17	G	180:8 184:21	246:22	73:21 76:5,6
170:19 206:4	G 3:9 6:1 280:24	190:17 200:12	going 10:4 12:1	78:3 81:5
264:6	GAB 6:25	215:12 218:3	12:15 13:19	98:13 99:12
frequently 87:18	Gaddie 107:14	234:13 250:10	19:6 20:2	114:19 138:8
87:21	107:17 108:5	given 32:23 34:3	23:23 33:3	138:14 199:25
Friday 93:12,13	108:23 109:3	102:9 108:16	43:18 47:13	202:14 212:15
93:14 164:8	109:11 110:9	114:3 117:21	48:10 52:20,21	212:16 221:21
175:15 188:9	112:7,22 113:5	120:8,9 125:9	59:20 60:16	222:1,15 223:7
206:14 248:18	139:1 168:5,11	130:8 131:2	61:13 64:4	223:9 225:11
Friedrich 31:1	168:15 169:5,8	135:5 168:9	68:10,21 69:17	goodness 103:15
37:14,23 39:14	169:9 171:25	177:9 185:16	74:5,10 75:24	gotten 82:21
49:20 50:10	172:4 177:15	249:20	77:13,13 78:24	138:7 202:18
56:4,20 58:12	177:22 188:16	giving 133:23	80:4,16 82:17	207:23
58:17 60:3,24	188:23 189:1	183:1 187:14	87:7 94:7 95:9	government
62:10 72:7,14	190:1,11,25	glad 163:6	95:9 99:12	1:13 2:1,12,15
88:25 89:1	191:18,24	235:16 236:9	102:4 107:8	6:9,14 84:25
161:9 173:14	192:3,17,22	GLADYS 1:8	111:17 116:18	212:17 233:19
186:14 190:2	193:9 250:10	GLORIA 1:4	122:13,15	280:16
Friedrich's	Gaddie's 169:1	go 9:12 10:3	124:14 125:3	governor 25:20
50:12	191:7	32:19 38:2	127:12 128:18	25:21 26:2,3
friend 101:12	gather 13:21	42:24 47:23	133:5 134:22	32:13 117:11
202:14 203:19	15:24 16:18,19	52:19 57:25	134:23 135:6	117:14 120:15

120:24	growth 148:25	181:15 185:24	257:22 259:14	6:25 7:1 18:25
governs 8:3	149:5 152:9	186:12 187:5	276:9	38:1 46:25
grammatical	216:12	187:10	hearings 8:25	53:21 68:5,9
125:8	guess 23:23 66:4	Handrick's	9:1 106:6	68:16 69:17
grand 227:3	76:11 95:25	32:17 33:9	115:12,13	71:6 79:4,8,11
Grandma 174:4	147:9 153:13	105:14 163:15	222:22	80:14 92:2,11
Gratz 226:15	168:9 170:25	164:18 167:19	hearsay 231:4	93:12,17 94:15
gray 89:16	265:11	177:2	233:15,20	102:24 105:3
great 18:17	guessing 173:9	hands 51:16	252:16 258:16	108:11,15,20
28:14 51:7	guidance 89:23	handwritten	259:2,10,23	108:24 109:5
62:24 126:1	182:25	132:20	260:25 261:1,9	111:8 116:11
166:4 172:22	guilt 52:12	happen 71:22	274:7,11	116:15 126:23
218:24 220:10	guy 18:7 76:6,6	153:24 190:24	heat 148:25	127:5 128:6
232:8 244:23	88:8 143:3	216:1 268:10	heels 51:1	146:11 151:6
272:10	guys 132:1,3	happened 143:8	held 27:4 123:22	157:19 175:9
Greek 180:16	138:12	143:9,10,15	215:1 238:1	175:13 188:5
Green 189:24	GWENDOLYNNE	148:10 187:17	help 36:24 38:6	202:5 203:10
grew 148:10	1:10	204:11 278:10	54:12 201:22	212:14 213:11
235:8		happening	helped 32:18	213:16 214:11
grocery 156:7	H	229:8	helps 114:18	217:2 218:21
Grofman 110:2	H 4:8 188:18	happens 156:19	herding 64:3	219:20,23
169:14,17,19	Hagen 1:21 2:23	happy 181:6	hesitant 99:19	220:1,5,10,20
169:23 172:17	280:3	199:25 206:18	100:4	221:1,14 222:4
172:18,22	hair 89:16	hard 18:15	hesitated 40:1	222:13 225:4
199:24 200:22	half 129:8	177:13 201:20	152:18 225:10	225:20 226:9
201:12,14	150:22,24	206:11	hesitating 39:15	226:21 227:11
202:2,12,18	151:2 157:22	hardware 61:2,4	39:21 160:18	228:1,8,12,23
203:7,14	271:21	headed 189:11	hesitation 30:10	229:9,15 230:7
204:17 205:5	halfway 234:3	heading 278:5	higher 243:24	230:19 231:1,6
205:15 246:15	Halma-Jilek 6:3	heads 84:10	246:20 256:7,9	231:17 232:4,8
Grofman's	282:22	hear 20:9 115:9	269:14,25	232:12,14
225:22 226:4,6	hand 162:21	166:20 181:7	270:9	233:10,18
ground 255:7	184:19 232:10	202:17 235:16	highlighted	234:1,10,17,24
grounds 213:15	handed 158:22	236:9 237:7	240:14,15,17	235:6,14,19
214:8 225:3	170:18 175:6	259:14,19	240:19 241:1	236:7,14,22
252:16 260:22	179:4 193:15	heard 97:1	hire 51:11 108:4	237:1,6,13,14
275:3	200:3,11	115:2,9 145:21	108:9 239:12	238:17,22
group 92:23	205:24 265:2	188:16 204:15	hired 38:22 40:4	239:15,24
104:5 139:22	Handrick 17:18	231:3 257:24	75:21,23	240:5,8 241:20
140:3,3,6	33:17 34:7	hearing 9:5,7	109:24	242:2,4 243:10
142:7 145:9				
	37:3 40:19	30:9 77:4,7	Hirschboeck	243:14,15
146:2,5 158:6	37:3 40:19 47:5,7 48:2,3,4	30:9 77:4,7 78:24 80:20	Hirschboeck 3:19 7:5 94:25	245:11 246:11
			3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9	
146:2,5 158:6	47:5,7 48:2,3,4	78:24 80:20	3:19 7:5 94:25	245:11 246:11
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4 grow 215:21	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1 165:2,6,12,15 166:11,15	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5 210:16 231:22	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20 256:4	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7 263:13,19,25
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4 grow 215:21 growing 215:17	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1 165:2,6,12,15	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5 210:16 231:22 231:24 232:25	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20 256:4 historical 45:2	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7 263:13,19,25 264:5 265:17
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4 grow 215:21 growing 215:17 215:21	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1 165:2,6,12,15 166:11,15 167:4,14 169:8 173:7 177:23	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5 210:16 231:22 231:24 232:25 234:5,14	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20 256:4 historical 45:2 history 8:14	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7 263:13,19,25 264:5 265:17 265:24 266:5
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4 grow 215:21 growing 215:17 215:21 grown 234:19	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1 165:2,6,12,15 166:11,15 167:4,14 169:8 173:7 177:23 179:8,15,19	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5 210:16 231:22 231:24 232:25 234:5,14 235:20 236:15	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20 256:4 historical 45:2 history 8:14 44:25	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7 263:13,19,25 264:5 265:17 265:24 266:5 266:15 267:24
146:2,5 158:6 180:17,20 197:18,22 213:14,14 228:3 242:6 250:4 groups 142:10 146:5 147:23 148:1 179:17 179:20,24 180:2,4,5,9 group's 213:4 grow 215:21 growing 215:17 215:21	47:5,7 48:2,3,4 48:6 49:20 57:5,6 58:15 58:19,23 61:21 71:12 87:16 90:3,9,10,25 95:10 106:3 116:8 117:4 138:4,5 139:2 159:9,19 163:8 163:11 164:1 165:2,6,12,15 166:11,15 167:4,14 169:8 173:7 177:23	78:24 80:20 81:18 82:21 85:10 115:21 115:23 117:7 118:18 119:2 131:11 136:13 136:14 137:14 137:20,21,22 137:23 141:12 144:15 151:22 197:5,8 205:11 205:16 207:5 210:16 231:22 231:24 232:25 234:5,14	3:19 7:5 94:25 281:9 Hispanic 139:4 148:11,15 212:21,25 217:8 221:21 221:23 222:15 222:17 223:4 237:18 238:10 239:17 241:9 242:16 249:3 250:7 255:20 256:4 historical 45:2 history 8:14	245:11 246:11 247:21,25 248:5,19 249:10 250:17 252:17 253:2 253:18,22 254:4 256:2,15 257:2 258:18 259:5,18,22,25 260:1,13,18 261:3,7,12 262:20 263:7 263:13,19,25 264:5 265:17 265:24 266:5

				ruge 270
269:20 270:3	193:13 205:22	223:12	227:5 233:12	24:24 95:7
270:12,22	264:24 273:21	improvement	248:8 252:12	110:4
271:24 273:3	identified 75:15	217:7,9,16	252:21 257:14	instance 2:20
274:10,14,19	129:4 185:1	219:1 256:11	265:8,21	137:14 177:22
274:24 277:2	194:8 247:7	256:16	indicates 31:19	203:20 280:10
277:14 278:17	267:5	improvements	37:13 38:18	instances
279:2,14 281:3	identify 14:24	218:15	48:5	137:17
hold 72:5 126:5	26:5 41:9 43:9	inaccurate	indicating 234:7	Institute 84:5,7
238:3 253:14	75:9 100:23	103:2 277:22	individual 59:4	instruct 174:19
Hollen 88:22	136:17 158:22	inadvertent	59:8 62:7,20	174:22 181:9
honest 41:21,25	159:24 175:19	267:12	71:13 72:13	instructed
honestly 27:21	179:6 193:18	inadvertently	197:19 212:18	265:12
29:3 181:4	194:10 200:19	266:23 267:12	246:18 262:8	instructing
272:2	identities	include 31:9,9	263:2	267:19
honesty 34:4	147:18	34:15 39:19	individuals 17:2	instruction
hook 134:23	identity 147:18	91:25	19:9,11 20:11	266:12
hooking 126:11	ID'D 4:9	included 16:14	21:13 23:24	instrumental
130:17 133:22	III 1:4	17:5,15 199:20	24:2,10,12	75:16
134:2	IL 125:12	209:1	inevitable	integral 230:16
hope 51:19	Illinois 110:21	including	141:17 235:7	intend 171:5
89:17 94:5	125:12 250:9	222:25 250:9	infer 271:11	200:14
143:10 145:23	251:17	inclusion 164:2	277:6	intended 25:23
182:2 216:13	imagine 36:24	inclusive 17:4	inference 83:4,8	125:21,23
hoped 216:16	immediately	incomplete	inferences 83:10	162:2 184:5
hopefully 161:6	51:1 119:7	47:21	128:4	intent 127:13
hoping 157:21	implication	Incorporated	infinite 122:6,7	213:2,4,5,13
157:23	40:18	6:4,13	154:2,17	214:6
HOUGH 1:7	implied 269:9	incorrect 39:18	156:17 198:21	intention
hour 32:1	implies 45:22,23	46:1 116:5	223:25 224:1	174:14 266:20
105:18 125:13	imply 277:6	131:2 146:15	influence 216:9	266:25
138:19 157:22	import 84:14	152:23 180:18	234:12	intentionally
hourly 35:23	importance	203:22 278:12	influenced	212:25 237:18
167:7	90:13,21	increase 217:15	202:22	238:9 239:17
hours 31:7,17	110:14,23	241:2	information	intentions 182:4
31:20 34:8	112:8,15	increased	59:10 62:2,9	intents 120:5
51:23 190:6	156:24	239:18 241:5	62:14,16 82:11	interest 74:6
264:14 273:17	important 32:23	incredibly 93:25	119:4 139:11	84:25 130:6
house 56:3 57:8	61:12 63:18	incumbent	144:9 201:6	interested 64:23
housed 54:16	89:21 92:7	218:7 233:1	207:20,23	84:16 119:13
Huh 132:2	101:21,24	incurred 31:24	219:13 221:20	133:10 140:14
humble 52:8	105:22 114:4	independence	222:6,8,23,24	140:14 160:2
humility 52:11	114:10,15	181:23 182:1	223:1 251:3,10	201:16 202:17
hundred 26:13	115:7,17 131:5	182:12	251:11,13,22	Interesting
I	135:9 156:8	independent	252:8 informed 14:3	109:13
	159:25 173:23	17:16,17 42:8 57:14 59:17,18	265:5	interests 96:6
idea 70:20 72:24 114:19 115:14	173:25 174:2,3 174:11 181:24	164:5,20	informing 13:18	internationally 203:17
	182:15 207:21		86:12	interpret 128:1
147:21 155:22		168:10 190:4 193:6 195:20	initialed 173:1	-
242:19,19 271:19	230:15,18 imposing 224:6	indicate 15:6	initially 161:23	interpreted 91:14 171:18
identical 70:5	imposing 224.0	26:19 82:25	251:2,2,10	interpreting
identification	262:7	136:18 144:10	innumerable	33:12
14:21 38:10	impression 77:8	167:18 251:21	154:15	interrogatories
78:16 81:11	140:17,19	254:24 258:6	input 102:15	280:11
83:13 85:3	improper 65:11	260:9,14	112:19 113:2	Intervenor-De
158:18 170:16	108:22 229:19	266:24	204:6	2:6
175:4 178:23	233:25	indicated 42:22	inquiring 86:14	Intervenor-Pl
184:14 187:24	improved	109:11 164:24	inquiry 23:7	1:11

	T	T	T	T
introduced	88:3 89:21	37:4 40:19	81:13 82:20	169:10 177:23
124:20	93:21 94:16,21	47:5,7,12 48:2	83:16 85:5,8	182:16 183:12
invited 80:10	94:24 95:2	48:3,4,6 49:20	85:25 86:5	186:17 239:7
97:24 180:21	136:2 159:9	61:21 75:14	106:15 117:5	242:23 251:7
invoice 31:3,5	195:8,14 210:6	87:16 95:18	120:17,22	271:12
invoices 30:17	210:10,12	105:14 106:3	124:16,25	kinds 91:5
	,		, and the second	
33:9	262:9	160:1 165:6,15	131:10 144:15	136:15 154:6
involve 76:12	item 81:5	169:8,8 176:18	151:22 199:6	knew 34:12
207:19 239:5	iterative 151:19	177:12,14,23	200:25 201:15	60:16 71:14
involved 7:20	153:2	179:8 182:2,4	201:24 203:6	137:24 140:5,8
8:8 22:14		182:17 183:2	205:11,16	144:20,23
27:16 32:19	<u>J</u>	187:13 188:18	210:16 221:8,9	145:1,1 160:2
33:1,8 34:5	J 2:4 3:13 281:3	198:4,18	231:21 232:17	168:15 177:22
35:2 36:22	Jacque 70:18	Joel 226:15	254:17 258:5	182:9 198:13
41:17,18 43:5	James 1:19 2:4	Joe's 34:3 35:1	274:4,17	215:16 262:9
50:14,24 52:20	2:19 4:3 6:5	35:25 182:3	275:22 276:10	271:6
54:1,23 55:1	7:10 87:12	John 54:20	276:10	know 9:1 12:6
59:3 63:10	178:19 179:1	JOHNSON 1:7	jump 164:7	12:23 13:17
71:11,25 72:10	272:18,23	join 183:3	166:14 167:13	16:17,17,18,21
73:15,16 74:2	279:17 280:6	214:13 227:10	186:5	17:23,24 18:4
74:17 75:19	January 13:13	229:6,24	June 27:11,11	18:14,14 19:24
88:7 93:4	15:2,4 24:25	230:10 231:5	27:11 76:14,14	20:2 22:7 23:8
106:16 108:4,8	25:1,5,9 30:5	231:16 235:4	106:15 107:20	24:6,7,14
108:8 131:1	158:13 159:18	236:21 238:15	108:1 120:14	26:10,11,13,16
146:2,6 160:3	160:20 163:9	239:1 241:25	138:1,24	27:2,13 29:20
167:5 197:19	164:2,8 166:11	249:8 253:1	139:15 141:11	32:22 33:1,12
197:20,21	171:8 172:3	258:17 259:4	146:10 190:13	34:22 36:9,18
203:15 211:21	179:13 181:16	261:11	190:16 193:21	36:20 37:8
224:11,23	JEANNE 1:5	joined 71:7	193:22 195:2	38:3,7 39:2
226:20 244:12	Jeff 23:17 24:12	182:4	198:2,9,17	40:20 41:1,21
245:12 250:7	38:25 40:9	joint 231:24	199:6 206:14	43:1,3 44:1,8
251:17	43:13 72:24	joking 94:10,10	208:1,9 249:24	44:12 45:4,7
involvement	187:1 199:16	Jose 2:8 101:11	260:8,12,23	45:12 47:3
32:11,13 53:13	Jefferson 3:8	101:12	Justice 3:15	48:21,22,22,24
110:24 163:19	280:23	Joseph 90:3,9	51:3,10 189:12	49:18 50:12
164:10,18	Jensen 52:24	95:9 117:3	190:9 281:5	52:12 54:18,19
165:16 169:2	53:8,18 54:15	139:2		54:24 56:18
226:22	54:25 55:11,15	Journal 145:16	K	57:24 58:18,19
involves 74:3	55:19,25 66:13	JR 2:4,4 3:21	Kahn 2:24 3:4	58:22 59:14,22
77:21 186:2	106:18,20	281:11	280:7,19	60:20 61:3,5
involving	Jensen's 55:10	JRT 11:19,19	karma 183:22	61:16,18,20,23
131:23 179:23	Jerry 101:13,14	78:8 219:24	keep 13:19 99:9	61:24 62:3,4,6
irony 189:7	Jim 81:24 90:20	265:13	263:3	62:11 64:24
Irvine 202:16	100:23 126:14	Jrtroupis@tro	Keith 138:25	65:1 66:1,24
Irwin 202:15,18	134:17 142:13	12:25	168:5,11	68:19 71:15,24
202:22 203:2	180:12,13	JRT123 220:1	177:15	73:19 75:22
isolate 92:24	181:11 201:4	JRT81 265:10	Kelly 90:17,24	76:6,9 77:7
issue 9:21 72:20	222:3 274:16	JRT87 253:18	Ken 51:11 150:6	80:16,21 81:4
115:17 141:4	Jingles 215:14	253:20,23	268:14	81:4 82:2,2,6
173:2 192:4,5	269:8	judge 187:20,20	KENNEDY 2:1	82:16,19,24
192:12,24	job 239:14	187:21,22	2:14	85:17 86:17,17
193:3 196:9	JoCasta 118:12	247:10 264:11	kept 176:16	87:25 88:19
210:1,23	118:19 133:5,6	265:7	177:5	89:25 92:22
244:17 250:1,2	154:4 215:3	judges 125:20	KEVIN 2:1,14	93:18 94:6
254:23 268:5	271:16	JUDY 1:5	kind 1:10 36:2	95:24 99:20,24
issues 11:13	Joe 17:18 32:17	July 9:7 76:14	58:3,4 89:12	100:8,12,14,15
12:10 29:18	32:18,21 33:2	77:4,19 78:20	117:1 148:8	100:3,12,14,13
59:23 77:2	33:9,17,24	78:25 80:19	150:17 154:25	100:19 102:17
09.40 11.4	33.3,17,44	10.40 00.19	150.17 154.25	104.17 100.13
L	ı	l .	I.	I.

106:17,18					
106:9.17,20,21	105:17 18	226.22 227.16	209.2 15 22	278:15	44.2 3 14 22
106:21,25 234:18 238:5 1073:109:18 240:12,18 241:11,19 114:10:179:23 102:14 234:19 244:25 248:21 113:11 114:1,9 244:25 248:21 245:21 245:21 245:21 245:21 246:12 (269:9) 258:14 262:5 269:17,25 270:20 270:20 270:25 270:20 234:13 233:3,121:21 278:8 279:1,4 278:1					
107:3 109:18 240:12,18 134:9 140:24 98:19 99:22 149:11,14 52:17 112:11,12 244:25 248:21 241:11 1679:23 244:35 248:21 245:20 244:6,7 245:3 269:15 233:91,1,13 131:11 114:1,9 250:9 258:12 245:11 225:20 244:6,7 245:11 266:12 268:9 275:8,16 278:1 229:10 123:1 275:8,16 278:1 229:10 123:1 275:8,279:14 233:2,32,32 24,24 124:1,5,7,8,8,9 17:17,22 19:22 256:25 57:15,18 133:21 134:6 144:3 120:10 134:25 135:8 140:3 145:11 135:10,14 145:13 149:15 136:21,22 245:6 248:11 245:6 248:11 13:10 90:14,23 139:24 143:13 139:24 143:13 139:24 143:13 156:22 31:10,14,15 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:18 156:23 155:19 156:23 155:19 123:20 124:9 115:24 123:3 156:22 31:19 123:20 124:9 115:24 123:3 156:23 155:13 156:22 31:4 116:05:17:10 163:22 164:15 165:5 169:1 203:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:91 139:22 149:9 144:81,10 139:22 149:9 144:81,10 139:22 149:9 144:81,10 139:14 146:14 177:15 156:22 31:15 166:15,16 169:1 203:14 146:19,18 177:19 126:18 127:4 111:13,14,20 118:14 120:6 168:13 169:1,4 188:31 199:14 146:11 192:8 139:21 149:14 146:91 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 139:22 140:9 144:81,10 149:22 149:5 149:22 149:25 149:2					
1119.11	•				
11:11:12					
113:11 114:1,9					
114:20,22,25 258:14 262:5 136:12 268:9 234:13 137:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17			· ·		
115:2.5 117:11					
117:12,22			_		
1183.3 121:21 275:8, 16 278:1 129:14, 21 278:21 32:22 35:13, 11, 14 35:19 36:9 3				, ,	*
122:9.10 123:1		*			
123:4,5,5,17					
123:20,23,23		*			
123:23,24,24					
124:1,5.7,8,8,9 17:17,22 19:22 120:7,19 14:10 42:19 164:13 171:17 129:20 133:21 134:6 14:3 120:10 134:25 135:8 14:3 149:15 135:10,14 145:13 149:15 135:10,14 145:13 149:15 137:5,7 139:10 139:24 143:13 149:15 139:24 143:13 149:15 139:24 143:13 149:15 139:24 143:13 149:15 139:24 143:13 149:15 139:24 143:13 149:15 144:8 146:14 146:15,23 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 147:12 148:8 100:10 101:6,6 100:22 103:5,20 139:10 139:13 150:23 152:5,8 123:10,14,15 150:23 155:13 156:2,3 156:7 155:21 156:4,5 157:10 163:2 129:10 155:25 1156:55 168:13 169:1,4 171:2,21 174:4 174:18 178:4 174:18 178:4 181:5,12 180:18 179:14 199:11 199:8 139:24 140:23 138:19 199:4 139:21 130:23 139:20 141:13 156:23 139:24 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 139:21 140:23 130:21 130:23 130:23 139:24				*	
125:21 129:20					
131:17,20,22					
133:21 134:6 140:3 145:11 145:13 149:15 140:3 145:11 145:13 149:15 15:10,14 136:21,22 245:6 248:11 145:13 149:15 245:6 248:11 193:20 194:2,5 193:20 194:16 199:11,14,15 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 202:15 239:14 100:10 101:6,6 100:22 101:22 202:15 239:14 100:22 103:5,20 100:22 103:5,20 100:22 103:5,20 100:22 103:5,20 100:24 100:24 200:22 100:24 200:22 100:24 200:22 100:24 100:23 100:24 101:1 100:15,19,24 110:15,19,2					
134:25 135:8 140:3 145:11 Latino 8:11 9:9 62:1 71:22 74:17 75:1 136:21,22 137:5,7 139:10 139:24 143:13 143:17,19 144:8 146:14 146:15,23 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 149:8,11 150:23 152:5,8 123:10,14,15 152:15,19,20 152:21 153:7,8 152:21 153:7,8 155:21 156:4,5 157:10 163:22 155:710 163:22 166:15,16 169:7,10 170:7 171:22,1174:4 174:18 178:4 180:14 181:2,4 181:5,12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 183:39 190:13 193:20 140:9 126:18 127:4 131:9 120:23 261:19 225:25 222:13 233:23,25					
135:10,14					
136:21,22					
137:5,7 139:10 258:1,4 8nown 3:16 97:20,21 98:17 93:10 94:16 199:11,14,15 139:24 143:13 143:17,19 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 144:8 146:14 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 144:8 146:14 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 144:8 146:14 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 144:8 146:14 15:24 123:3 104:5,13,24 150:23 152:5,8 123:10,14,15 105:9 110:11 230:17 230:17 225:25 229:13 155:21 153:7,8 124:11 144:24 111:1,3,14,20 155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 131:2,12 114:5 155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 131:2,12 114:5 169:1,203:14 114:11,20,23 169:1,4 169:7,10 170:7 171:2,21 174:4 174:18 178:4 181:5,12 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:18,19 188:19 193:4,5 196:4 141:14 139:7 141:14 139:7 141:14 139:7 145:8,10,18,25 193:4,5 196:4 148:25 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 196:6,10 197:2 220:27,11 203:6 220:27,11 203:6 220:27,11 203:6 220:27,11 203:6 220:27:15 239:14 240:20 27:27:2 220:13 234:19 100:23					
139:24 143:13			,		
143:17,19	*	*		*	
144:8 146:14 75:25 76:10 100:12,14,20 120:24 200:22 261:19 146:15,23 78:13 99:20,21 100:22 101:22 202:15 239:14 149:8,11 115:24 123:3 104:5,13,24 150:23 152:5,8 123:10,14,15 105:9 110:11 105:9 110:11 120:25:15,19,20 123:20 124:9 110:15,19,24 153:23 155:13 156:2,23 165:7 123:20 124:9 110:15,19,24 111:1,3,14,20 125:21 153:7,8 124:11 144:24 111:1,3,14,20 127:7 238:14 243:9 155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 113:2,12 114:5 40:24,24 47:5 263:12,18 169:1,0 163:22 164:15 165:5 168:13 169:1,4 169:7,10 170:7 170:7 171:2,21 174:4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,9 189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 135:12,19 139:20 141:13 191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 146:9,18,25 193:4,5 196:4 196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 200:8 201:7,20 200:7,11 203:6 100:22 17:2,20 22:7,22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 14:16,17 200:8 201:7,20 200:18,24 205:2 206:5,22 208:11 211:20 100:22 180:9 100:22 18:20 100:21 10:22 100:11 120:14 14:6,17 100:23 100:24 111:8 14:20:6 14:20:14-12 16:20:18 16:2	I .				
146:15,23	,		,		
147:12 148:8	I .				
149:8,11		*			_
150:23 152:5,8 123:10,14,15 105:9 110:11 230:17 225:25 229:13 152:15,19,20 123:20 124:9 110:15,19,24 111:13,14,20 123:23 155:13 155:21 156:4,5 155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 155:21 156:5 165:15,16 113:2,12 114:5 40:24,24 47:5 263:12,18 129:10 169:7,10 170:7 169:7,10 170:7 169:7,10 170:7 170:7 170:7 170:7 170:18 178:4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,4 180:14 181:2,12 186:18,19 189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 114:14 139:7 119:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 144:8,20,21 171:19 173:15 186:6,10 197:2 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 240:20 241:14 146:9,18,25 190:6,10 197:2 200:8 201:7,20 200:7,11 203:6 200:7,20 200:17,20 204:18,24 200:7,20 202:7,11 203:6 200:17,20 204:18,24 200:20 240:18,24 200		,	*		
152:15,19,20					
152:21 153:7,8 124:11 144:24 111:1,3,14,20 127:7 lawyer 7:18,24 243:13 259:11 155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 169:1 203:14 111:1,3,14,20 127:7 lawyer 7:18,24 243:13 259:11 164:15 165:5 169:1 203:14 118:14 120:6 67:14 88:23 learn 241:21 168:13 169:1,4 231:8 123:17 126:9 89:2 93:10 learned 109:19 171:2,21 174:4 174:18 178:4 174:18 178:4 181:5,12 Lawyer 18:6 136:25 137:9 13					
153:23 155:13 156:2,23 165:7 112:3,9,15 132:3,15 14:11,20,23 14:11,20,23 14:11,20,23 14:11,20,23 14:11,20,23 16:13 169:1,4 231:8 123:17 126:9 13:2,17 126:19 127:18 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,17 13:1,1					*
155:21 156:4,5 165:15,16 169:1 203:14 113:2,12 114:5 40:24,24 47:5 169:1 203:14 118:11,20,23 47:7 65:1 16aps 234:19 169:7,10 170:7 168:13 169:1,4 93:14 100:23 127:16 129:18 13:19 121:22 174:4 181:5,12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 182:22 183:12 193:4,5 196:4 114:14 139:7 193:4,5 196:4 193:4,5 196:4 193:4,5 196:4 193:4,5 196:4 193:4,5 196:5 240:20 241:14 196:6,10 197:2 200:8 201:7,20 202:7,11 203:6 203:17,20 202:7,11 203:6 203:17,20 202:7,11 203:6 203:17,20 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 222:7 224:17 222:7 224:17 220:27 222:7 224:17 270:8,9,11 36:21 38:24 129:14,14,19 193:44 120:6 67:14 88:23 47:7 65:1 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:15 47:19 173:5 47:7 65:1					
157:10 163:22	I .				
164:15 165:5				*	
168:13 169:1,4 169:7,10 170:7 171:2,21 174:4 174:18 178:4 180:14 181:2,4 181:5,12 182:22 183:12 182:23 183:12 189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 191:11 192:8 193:4,5 196:4 196:6,10 197:2 197:5 198:25 200:8 201:7,20 202:7,11 203:6 203:17,20 204:18,24 205:2 206:5,22 208:11 211:20 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 230:8 123:17 126:9 126:18 127:4 113:19 121:22 115:6 248:9 126:18 127:4 133:19 121:22 162:19 178:5 162:19 178:5 162:19 178:5 189:10 279:9 189:10 279:10 189:10 279:5 189:10 279:5 189:10 279:5 189:10 279:5 189:10 279:5 189:10 279:5					
169:7,10 170:7					
171:2,21 174:4 174:18 178:4 180:14 181:2,4 181:5,12 182:22 183:12 182:8 3:10 6:13 6:22 64:5 141:14 139:7 141:18,20,21 187:16 230:8 191:11 192:8 193:4,5 196:4 196:6,10 197:2 197:5 198:25 200:8 201:7,20 200:7,11 203:6 203:17,20 202:7,12 204:18,24 205:2 206:5,22 208:11 211:20 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 208:11 211:20 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 208:12 170:15 180:18 118:24 127:16 129:18 131:7 134:7 131:7 134:7 131:7 134:7 131:7 134:7 139:20 141:13 135:12,19 136:25 137:9 136:25 137:9 139:20 141:13 148:21 49:25 88:6,13 94:25 56:22 160:12 16g 155:15,16,16 16g 195:15 171:19 173:15 16g 155:15,16,16 16g 195:15 144:18,20,21 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:5 230:16 250:18 21:19 230:16 250:5 230:16 2					
180:14 181:2,4 L L 135:12,19 136:25 137:9 136:25 14:25 13:15 136:25 137:9 136:25 14:25 13:15 146:23 27:3 141:20 144:2 146:30,18,22 146:9,18,25 144:18,20,21 146:9,18,25 146:9,18					
181:5,12	174:18 178:4	KRESBACH 1:5	131:7 134:7	239:9	189:10 279:9
182:22 183:12 la 2:8 3:10 6:13 39:20 141:13 88:6,13 94:25 56:22 160:12 186:18,19 6:22 64:5 14:20 144:2 171:19 173:15 leg 155:15,16,16 189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 144:18,20,21 187:16 230:8 legal 9:8 27:25 191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 38:2 48:18 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 146:9,18,25 Lazar 3:18 71:7 50:4 75:3 197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 229:10 95:2 105:22 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 106:11 112:12 208:11 211:20 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	180:14 181:2,4		135:12,19	lawyers 18:6	leaving 50:23
182:22 183:12 la 2:8 3:10 6:13 139:20 141:13 88:6,13 94:25 56:22 160:12 186:18,19 6:22 64:5 141:20 144:2 171:19 173:15 leg 155:15,16,16 189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 144:18,20,21 187:16 230:8 legal 9:8 27:25 191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 38:2 48:18 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 146:9,18,25 Lazar 3:18 71:7 50:4 75:3 197:5 198:25 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 71:8 281:8 87:24 89:7,9 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 229:10 95:2 105:22 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 10:11:12:12 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19		L			left 50:9 56:22
189:3 190:13 114:14 139:7 144:18,20,21 187:16 230:8 legal 9:8 27:25 191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 38:2 48:18 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 146:9,18,25 Lazar 3:18 71:7 50:4 75:3 196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 71:8 281:8 87:24 89:7,9 197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 95:2 105:22 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19		la 2:8 3:10 6:13	139:20 141:13	88:6,13 94:25	56:22 160:12
191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 38:2 48:18 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 146:9,18,25 Lazar 3:18 71:7 50:4 75:3 196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 71:8 281:8 87:24 89:7,9 197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 202:7,11 203:6 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 1eader 20:21 95:2 105:22 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 1eader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	186:18,19	6:22 64:5	141:20 144:2	171:19 173:15	leg 155:15,16,16
191:11 192:8 139:22 140:9 145:8,10,18,22 230:16 250:5 38:2 48:18 193:4,5 196:4 144:6,11 146:9,18,25 Lazar 3:18 71:7 50:4 75:3 196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 71:8 281:8 87:24 89:7,9 197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 202:7,11 203:6 lack 42:23 198:23 214:19 229:10 95:2 105:22 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19			144:18,20,21		
196:6,10 197:2 240:20 241:14 148:22 149:5 71:8 281:8 87:24 89:7,9 197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 202:7,11 203:6 1ack 42:23 198:23 214:19 229:10 95:2 105:22 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	191:11 192:8		145:8,10,18,22	230:16 250:5	38:2 48:18
197:5 198:25 242:8 257:24 156:9 195:17 lead 50:18 51:4 89:10 92:3,12 200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 1anguage 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	193:4,5 196:4	144:6,11	146:9,18,25	Lazar 3:18 71:7	50:4 75:3
200:8 201:7,20 280:25 195:25 197:4 89:2 136:9 94:16,21,24 202:7,11 203:6 1ack 42:23 198:23 214:19 229:10 95:2 105:22 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	196:6,10 197:2	240:20 241:14	148:22 149:5	71:8 281:8	87:24 89:7,9
202:7,11 203:6 lack 42:23 198:23 214:19 229:10 95:2 105:22 203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	197:5 198:25	242:8 257:24	156:9 195:17		89:10 92:3,12
203:17,20 102:24 111:8 214:25 215:11 leader 20:21 106:11 112:12 204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19		280:25	195:25 197:4		
204:18,24 146:23 270:3 215:16 223:4 22:7,25 23:19 112:16 114:6 205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19		lack 42:23		229:10	95:2 105:22
205:2 206:5,22 270:22 279:2 223:13 234:6 27:2,13 28:6 114:16,17 208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	•	102:24 111:8			106:11 112:12
208:11 211:20 LANGE 1:8 234:12 242:15 30:12,21 33:4 121:6,9 126:9 212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19	•		215:16 223:4		112:16 114:6
212:4 220:7 language 79:10 250:2 258:8,21 33:22 34:1,21 126:19 127:18 222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19					
222:7 224:17 80:7 172:15 270:8,9,11 36:11 38:24 129:14,14,19		LANGE 1:8			
224:20 225:16 186:11,20 271:2,10 40:7 43:12 129:21,25					
	224:20 225:16	186:11,20	271:2,10	40:7 43:12	129:21,25

130:5 136:2,10	lesser 269:17	173:17 185:9	LLC 3:23 281:13	22:25 69:6
136:19 141:4	letter 4:10,11	186:21,22,23	lobbying 182:10	70:14 134:1,1
156:21,25,25	13:5 14:6,7,8	191:22 213:25	182:16	138:16 149:9
157:7,10 195:8	14:14,25 15:23	214:2 236:18	local 210:18	190:19 195:5
209:19 214:16	16:23,24 17:6	246:24 247:15	211:11	200:24 201:8
216:20 219:10	23:21 28:22,25	254:24 259:23	locally 156:16	202:2 223:22
230:13 238:21	29:15,17 30:7	lines 48:1 68:13	locate 52:15	224:3 237:9
248:17 250:8	36:8 37:9 38:4	150:14 214:10	located 52:25	275:6 277:15
278:14	38:16,21 39:11	224:1	53:5 58:5	278:3
legality 122:1,3	40:25 41:16,16	lingering 10:2	115:16	looks 78:2 86:2
legally 40:16	42:7,12 44:11	list 17:2,4,5,8	locked 96:19	126:2 134:12
199:2	45:14 158:11	31:17 77:17,20	244:11	135:1 136:6
legislation	161:5 172:1,9	124:16 132:18	locusts 114:1	143:7 150:23
96:16 209:3,4	172:13 183:11	138:5 162:25	long 29:17 32:19	183:16 206:10
209:17,19	185:7,7,9,11	170:8 199:18	43:24 65:1	278:2
210:7,22	185:12 186:6	201:21 214:21	74:10 75:25	loose 87:15
legislative 8:6	186:12,15,16	219:19,20	76:2,4,7,7,9,10	lose 144:2 244:8
32:14 53:16	letters 30:13	253:24 264:17	77:10 80:22	lost 25:18 87:5
59:19 63:11	126:1 175:10	265:7 273:24	94:1 95:15	89:16
105:24 109:17	176:5,12 177:5	listed 16:1 21:13	96:6 97:19,24	lot 8:9 11:11,11
112:17 154:15 195:9 209:16	187:7,9 276:13 let's 9:18 37:4	24:8 28:21 132:14	98:24 99:21,22 104:15 105:1	12:1 34:2 36:25 50:6
211:25 222:9	38:8 45:15	listen 116:5	105:11 157:19	61:11 88:1
262:23 263:1	52:3,14 62:5	literally 190:6	165:7 183:5	99:3,21 114:22
263:21	64:18,18 99:13	literature 92:19	199:4 205:25	115:15 121:16
legislator 61:25	101:2 104:19	92:20	211:13 216:25	123:20 127:19
legislators 8:7	110:3 117:2	litigation 19:17	238:1	134:25 147:15
27:7 59:4,9	122:11 123:1	50:19 109:20	longest 36:21	147:15 150:3
62:7 63:12,17	126:15 127:21	121:19 140:25	look 17:7 20:22	153:24 167:25
63:18,25 64:7	130:10 131:23	141:12,14,17	22:24 29:2	210:12
64:12 71:13	133:2 134:3	141:19 161:17	129:20 132:16	love 166:20
72:8,13 173:18	149:16 175:1	161:24 162:16	132:17,18	lower 221:23
198:5 246:18	178:16 181:14	168:20 177:5	134:3 138:8	222:17 256:8
261:21 262:8	183:25 203:3	178:7 186:3,7	142:11,15,19	269:17 270:1
legislature 9:8	205:19 254:16	204:20 224:15	143:11,14,22	270:11
18:21 26:6	259:13 272:16	224:18 244:24	158:20 162:25	lucrative 181:24
28:7 39:13	276:6	246:17	170:8 171:1	L-I-K-I 180:16
40:4,6 42:19	level 89:15	litigator 66:3	172:10 175:7	
43:10 44:6,24	115:1 145:19	little 9:19 41:3	184:16,21,25	M
45:19,20,24	146:6 182:12	54:9 114:25	185:20 190:25	M 3:5 280:20
48:19 60:16	211:11,11	130:24 155:19	192:23 194:19	machine 282:1
64:2,6,14	212:4 242:16	158:12 171:19	194:20 200:4	Madison 3:17
71:18 74:24	242:22 269:14	189:6 196:2	200:13,16	60:15 71:9
75:1 114:9	levels 270:9,11	197:25 201:2	206:4 214:16	114:14 179:24
120:23 122:16	levity 184:2,6	202:12 206:11	219:15 220:25	180:6,7 182:7
151:7,11,21,25	202:25 Lewis 3:25 7:6,7	215:18 239:3	224:2,7 225:21	188:24 189:2,4
158:8,14 159:13 173:24	281:15	254:10 257:10 257:25 262:1	239:9 240:3 242:5 253:11	281:7 Main 3:16 281:6
174:10 196:25	liberty 84:6,8,15	276:3	253:19 271:4,5	maintain 72:20
216:5 262:2,5	lieu 247:12	1ive 55:18 64:5	274:9	89:18
262:12	life 122:24	148:14,15	looked 12:2	maintained
legitimacy	156:18	247:12	29:16,24 69:11	210:19
122:1	Liki 180:16	lived 148:9	89:12 130:24	maintaining
length 8:24	limit 244:21	157:2,8	142:20 144:24	181:23,25
lengths 218:24	line 90:4,4,9,10	lives 100:22	148:19 207:8	182:12
lengthy 32:23	95:11,11 155:6	154:5,10,24	251:22 252:12	major 13:14
259:10	155:15 161:15	living 154:11	253:12 258:2	50:4 51:14,18
LESLIE 1:4	166:14 173:1	182:9	looking 20:15	51:18 52:1

167:23	277:18	275:11	maximize	153:13,23
majority 10:22	MALDEF's	Maria 3:17 71:7	245:24	154:12 158:24
11:1,9 20:21	129:17	281:7	MAXINE 1:7	160:16 164:21
22:7,25 23:19	man 82:18	mark 14:16 38:8	Mayer 51:11	167:20,20
27:2,13 28:6	Manny 101:3,5,5	77:14 78:12	150:6 260:4	172:20 180:4
30:11,21 33:4	101:17,17	124:22 158:15	265:18,20,22	181:4,25 182:2
33:22 34:1,21	106:25 122:18	175:2 205:19	266:2,17 268:2	182:3 183:19
36:11 38:24	123:1 126:12	264:8 273:19	268:14	185:16 190:23
40:7 43:12	130:18,22	marked 4:9	ma'am 103:17	194:23 197:16
44:13,22 46:3	131:3,5,15,24	14:20,23 28:12	MBF000218	223:17 225:15
49:11,14 52:17	133:10,19,23	37:2 38:9,12	265:5	242:14 243:21
57:11 74:22	133:25 134:2,7	69:4,16 70:8	MB&F 173:1,2	243:23 252:2
75:8,12 90:14	134:15,19,24	78:15 81:10	McGiver 54:20	255:11 262:13
90:23 118:20	135:3,7,11,15	83:12 85:2	55:25	271:24 274:16
161:7 162:9,9	136:12,18,20	116:6 124:14	McLeod 4:10	275:5 277:7
164:16,18	257:19	131:24 132:16	13:6,8,12,15	meandering
171:17 174:16	Manny's 135:2	138:3 149:24	13:15 14:11	217:1
174:17,20	Manuel 101:3	158:17 162:22	15:2,18 16:3,7	meaning 91:12
182:13,24	MANZANET 1:8	165:25 166:2	17:20 19:25	145:2
186:24 187:16	map 71:20 81:22	170:15 175:3	20:16 22:14	meanly 140:18
199:15,16	98:24 108:6,9	178:22 179:5	24:3,16,21	means 21:8
234:6 235:17	108:21 118:23	184:13,20	25:4,8 48:25	91:13 92:18
235:17 236:10	125:3 131:6,15	187:23 191:16	51:16 67:1	127:13 129:10
236:10 237:7	131:18 133:20	193:12,16	75:21 78:6	133:23
241:9	134:9,9 135:20	200:12 205:21	88:7,15 89:9	meant 125:15
majority/min	139:14 143:19	219:14 220:24	90:13 117:4	246:1
80:25 216:14	143:20 144:4,4	221:2 237:11	139:1 159:10	measure 141:16
makeup 196:12	151:18,24	264:23 265:3	159:20 163:18	187:15 216:3
196:18	194:19,24	273:20	167:22 168:3	mechanism
making 34:18	198:13,20	Marquette 76:19	175:25 191:24	30:15
77:25 83:6	199:11,13	76:22	206:17,22,25	medical 156:8
90:13 113:9	211:25 212:24	marriage 94:6	207:6 221:5	meet 27:7 71:12
127:16 131:1	214:17 221:25 222:19 227:20	married 182:6,6	276:12	128:15 174:19
154:6 172:25 196:3 255:16	228:3,9,13	Mary 52:24 54:19	McLeod's 62:18 mean 8:20 12:7	174:22 189:4 189:19
258:25 259:1	229:2 238:9	match 36:19	14:1 22:5,12	meeting 81:21
266:13	245:22 255:12	81:22	24:5,6 26:11	86:13 114:17
MALDEF 93:20	261:20 262:15	materials 39:19	26:15,18 29:2	120:6 163:11
95:6 102:3,4	262:17,22	matter 36:3	33:13 39:2	173:18 179:16
110:17 111:13	277:19	50:24 53:7	40:15 43:16	179:23 190:1
125:3 128:14	maps 109:25	96:20 105:24	48:3 49:17	190:23 193:20
128:21 129:2	110:5 118:24	108:18 109:12	51:18 53:21	196:23 198:8
129:23 130:7	119:2,9 131:20	114:6,6,16	56:15 64:24	meetings 26:20
133:24 134:16	141:16 143:15	121:19 128:3	65:2 73:12,16	26:23 27:1,4,8
135:2,3,10	148:25 149:4	130:9 131:14	74:19 79:5,6,8	27:11,18,21
141:23,25	153:18 174:12	146:8 161:24	79:10 80:15	48:2 71:21
146:16 196:4	190:11,19	186:2,21	83:19 92:17	72:5,8,12,12
198:24 219:3	198:3,16 201:5	202:20 208:14	94:12 99:2,20	72:15,16
219:11 249:16	201:11,14,17	214:4 230:1	101:5 108:1	107:21,25
249:19,25	201:18 202:3	233:17 238:21	112:24,25	113:1 173:24
250:3,19 251:6	205:6,8,16	266:21 281:20	117:16 127:12	190:15,19
254:25 255:24	207:22 211:6	mattered 128:20	127:22 137:21	193:23 194:1
256:8,11,17	212:23 226:23	matters 21:5	140:18,18	194:22 195:1,3
257:12 258:11	226:25 229:20	50:22 65:15,16	143:7,8 144:4	196:10,17
259:1,7,15	252:22 255:7	82:9 84:14,17	145:24 146:20	197:23 198:5
273:10,12	259:8 260:10	159:15,21	146:21 147:12	207:18,25
274:8,13 276:7	260:12,15,23	161:17 186:7	147:15 148:8	208:2
276:14 277:11	261:17 263:22	239:10 262:3	151:6,9 152:19	member 10:17
	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

45:24 46:4	Michael 1:14	241:12,22	125:17	247:8
		244:13,19,23		
49:2 64:13	2:13 27:9,20		missing 275:18	mouth 145:25
71:18 89:9,10	28:1,6 29:7,12	245:3 248:23	misspeak 100:2	move 96:18
99:17 102:20	30:10,12,16,17	250:3 251:4,5	misspelled	148:2 153:18
106:10 107:1	31:1 36:12	256:20,22	134:13 192:7	183:4,6 217:1
121:6,9 210:25	37:14,23 38:22	257:4,7 258:7	misspelling	222:12 225:13
263:2 270:19	39:13 46:15,23	258:13,21	142:7	231:4 236:17
272:5	49:19 50:10,11	280:2,7,20,23	misstate 182:3	246:23 247:15
members 1:13	52:16,24,25,25	281:2,10 282:9	misstatement	248:11 252:25
2:12 6:8,14	53:3,9,12,17	Milwaukee's	45:21,22	258:23 259:3
26:14,22 44:10	54:3,16,21	112:8 146:9,25	misstates	259:11,23
64:2 73:12,22	56:4,20,22,25	mind 40:2 93:7	142:25	261:10
74:18 97:22	57:7 58:5,11	mine 36:17	mistake 65:23	moved 148:16
99:18,24,25	58:17 60:3,24	116:3 204:2	mistaken	148:17 153:19
100:8,14	61:22 62:10	240:14	172:12	229:20,21
104:12,23	71:22 72:6,14	Minimal 71:4	misunderstand	movement
105:8 110:10	88:13,25 89:1	minimum 21:19	204:8	147:23 148:6
138:22 142:16	160:10,11	minor 241:8	misunderstan	153:12,21
142:23 148:14	161:8 172:14			· ·
		minorities 148:7	41:8 210:13,15	movements
165:20 173:24	173:14 182:14	244:8	misunderstan	216:16
174:9,15,20,23	186:14 190:2	minority 44:3	43:18	moves 96:16
180:5 199:20	229:20,21	74:13,18 81:21	Mm-hm 176:21	moving 182:7
206:18 207:1,7	Michelle 1:21	81:25 92:23	mobile 84:3	235:16 236:9
207:20 208:7	2:22 18:12	141:6 148:1	mode 18:8	municipal
208:21 212:18	280:3	174:16,23	model 53:8,9	145:19
258:21 262:2	middle 107:22	195:12 199:20	55:11,15	municipalities
262:15 263:2	155:14 168:4	214:17,18	modern 244:5	209:2 211:4,17
280:16	221:4 255:7	215:10 216:23	254:12	249:12,13
membership	Middleton 3:24	222:2,9 223:1	moment 36:23	mysterious
179:23 180:2,4	189:24 281:14	223:7,10 244:1	37:19 38:14	185:12
180:8	midst 71:4	minority/maj	69:9 99:20	
memo 166:16,23	Millis 35:3	214:24 215:6	116:10 124:17	N
167:19	Milwaukee 1:20	218:3,10	138:8 162:25	N 3:3 4:1 6:1
memorialize	2:25 3:5,8,12	minute 23:14	177:24	280:18
39:22 253:3	3:20 6:4 8:11	29:14,14,14	Monday 179:16	nail 45:15
261:15	84:10 93:3	35:22 36:8	194:1 196:10	name 6:2 17:1
memorializes	97:4 99:22	86:2,6 99:19	196:17 275:21	84:6 113:9
14:10	100:12,19,20	116:16 130:25	money 129:23	226:14 249:21
memory 20:3	100:23 101:19	139:18 175:7	130:1,7 203:25	250:21 255:4
36:15,25 37:1	104:6 111:1,3	184:21 194:15	monitor 137:7	named 247:21
192:3 225:11	111:14,20	200:13 208:2	monitoring	247:24
mention 185:3	112:20 113:13	216:19 254:22	136:24 137:2	names 225:17
	114:21 123:21	258:2	month 30:24	
253:4,5	126:19 137:1,8	minutes 80:23		name's 158:24
mentioned	,		31:18,19	narrative 217:1
115:13 123:8	137:10,12	133:15,16,18	141:11 146:10	narrowly 19:15
194:15 198:7	139:5,20 140:6	134:20 140:20	189:14 255:18	national 129:24
269:7	144:20 145:8,9	175:12 178:14	monthly 33:5	196:3,4 198:23
mentioning	145:16 146:3,6	187:19 268:22	34:10 167:7	nature 29:22
217:21	146:7,18,20	269:2	172:25	35:18 63:16
message 181:22	147:16 149:4	mischaracteri	months 119:5	64:6 74:25
183:1	152:20,25	138:17	170:1	84:11 94:10
met 123:24	182:7,10 194:2	misheard	MOORE 1:5,10	209:15 210:22
128:16 129:6	194:11,23	274:25	morning 93:15	Near 76:17
144:14 189:20	195:2,5,9,10	misinterpret	93:24 140:21	nearly 244:20
232:24 250:21	196:1 201:18	66:18	265:11 267:3	necessarily
252:5	205:2 208:11	misleading	Moscow 166:17	42:22 98:4
meticulous 82:7	216:18 223:14	277:8	Moses 174:4	184:6 215:15
Mexican 219:10	238:4 240:23	misread 100:5	motion 236:21	228:20 246:2

		1	T	I
necessary	218:2,10,23	109:8,9	231:14 233:8	occasion 107:21
177:10,12,14	238:7 272:7	notes 282:1	233:14,22	123:24 252:3
178:12 242:15	newly 218:3	notice 15:5 17:1	234:8,16,22	occur 27:19
need 9:14,25	newspaper 67:3	86:25 118:9	235:3,12,13,18	72:17 74:15
22:1 37:1 41:4	137:10	noticed 140:2	236:12 238:24	78:24 103:7,23
49:3 53:14	newspapers 55:3	nots 103:24	239:21 241:15	154:1
54:11,12 61:16	66:7	number 6:10,16	241:17,23	occurred 30:14
61:18 67:15	nice 221:24	7:20 18:17,18	243:7 245:9	59:1 73:17
74:5 81:24		31:17 33:3	246:10,21	115:12 129:22
82:5 94:7 97:8	222:18 NICHOL 1:14	35:4 47:21	247:8,14 249:7	134:19 151:18
				205:3
106:6 134:9	2:13	54:22 78:9,11	252:15,24	
171:18 177:7	night 11:17	82:8 84:3	256:13,23	occurring
206:8 219:22	93:12,13,14,22	88:22 104:8	258:16 259:2,9	148:21 208:9
220:5 236:1,4	94:5 107:24	122:6 124:19	260:11,21	odds 239:18
241:5 243:22	175:9 189:25	124:23 131:2,4	263:6 269:20	offered 251:3
264:17,20	Nina 110:20,20	133:11,13,25	270:12 275:3	offering 229:2
266:11	113:8 196:6	135:2,6 156:17	objected 90:24	233:16
needed 49:8	249:21	158:25 170:10	102:11 147:8	offhand 11:13
60:20 82:23	nineties 45:3	171:13 175:21	objection 38:1	107:4
83:2 106:4	nobody's 94:12	175:22 178:19	46:25 58:9	office 3:16,23
141:5 144:3	148:16	178:25 179:23	79:4 80:7,14	7:7 12:23 21:4
208:7 209:21	nondisclosure	188:9 196:22	90:16 92:2,11	28:21 50:9
246:19 262:10	69:22	198:21 205:1	102:24 108:11	56:23 57:7
262:10	nonlegal 112:17	206:1,9 207:4	109:8,9 111:8	75:18 94:20
needs 120:6	nonlitigation	208:15 214:20	126:23 147:10	230:6 249:23
275:14	161:17	214:22,23	203:10 214:13	281:6,13
nefarious	nonminority	224:2 241:8	229:13 230:10	offices 3:7 27:8
231:11	218:9	243:25 244:22	233:22 235:22	27:20 50:12
negatively 148:6	nonresponsive	246:8 250:8	238:15 239:23	56:15,17,20
negotiate 32:18	216:25	254:8 257:18	258:17 259:20	72:17 180:7
34:25	noon 125:13	272:18,22	259:21 260:16	190:2 280:22
negotiated 35:2	normal 18:9	275:8,9	261:10 277:14	official 1:14
negotiating 33:2	57:2,2,18	numbers 81:23	278:17 279:2	2:13 26:6
negotiation 39:8	63:21,22 66:8	82:4,22 83:1	objections 235:5	27:14 232:16
134:14 136:6,9	71:16 72:9	91:25 140:15	238:19,24	233:18 237:5
227:17	263:9,15,20	206:3 222:1,3	259:4	off-site 230:23
neighborhood	normally 177:17	223:3,6,9,17	objective 41:19	oh 11:16 37:4
149:12 152:6	186:15	223:19 242:23	objectively	73:14,14 75:13
152:13	north 2:25 3:4,7	243:5,17 244:8	82:19	76:5 97:6
neighborhoods	3:12 155:3	245:1 252:13	obligated 239:9	103:15 107:16
147:17,22	255:10 273:7	210.1 202.10	obligation 267:1	132:10 168:16
148:5,7 152:21	280:7,19,22	0	267:7	180:10 183:20
152:24	281:2	0 6:1	obligations	191:18 199:25
neither 62:3	northern 155:7	oath 21:20 22:1	67:15 267:8	200:2 204:24
70:21	269:15,24	object 9:12	oblivious 122:14	208:16 210:5
never 18:1,2	north-south	42:21 55:13	observation	263:5 269:11
22:17 47:8	273:13 276:18	57:24 60:6,7	120:10	okay 7:20 8:23
74:14 82:10	276:19	,		9:6 10:13
		65:20 99:4	observing	
90:12,20 129:6	Notary 2:23	142:25 147:1	120:11	12:14,14 13:5
144:13,14	280:4 282:6	213:7,14 214:7	obtain 18:20	18:2,17 19:12
145:21 148:12	notch 155:12,12	216:24 218:19	62:1,8	19:15 20:3
189:15 204:11	155:13,14,19	221:12,18	obtained 224:17	21:20 24:11
240:1 264:12	155:20,23	222:11 225:2	obtaining 80:12	25:22 26:5
new 10:10 152:3	156:1,6	225:24 226:18	obtuse 254:10	28:17 31:22
153:1 154:7	note 109:10	227:8,22 228:5	obviously	32:6 36:13
158:14 159:17	205:11	228:18 229:4	101:24 152:19	37:4,13,21
206:18 207:1,8	noted 17:6	229:12,22,24	202:21,23,23	38:15,21 40:15
217:3,13,24	20:11 47:22	230:9,24	203:24,25	42:6,10,17,17

45:15 46:6	old 143:3 149:13	197:15,19	280:18,18	230:13,15,16
49:8 57:17	150:8,15,17,18	199:1	pack 242:22	238:4 240:1
59:16 60:1	150:21,22,24	oral 14:9	245:1	262:6 266:7
62:5,22 65:3	151:3,4 152:4	ordeal 36:21	packed 244:1,7	269:18,24
66:4 67:7	151:5,4 152:4	order 13:20	Packers 112:4	270:1 272:7
68:22 69:5,9	217:3,12	67:17 70:17,23	page 1:17 4:2	participant 59:6
70:16 74:23	218:22 271:17	81:6 153:15	15:5 83:22	participate
75:3 80:6,12	271:23	154:19 166:8	90:4,9 95:11	32:24 74:7
84:2 85:23	older 85:24	199:1 239:10	138:11 161:12	118:1 168:14
87:23 89:5,12	OLGA 2:8	239:12 241:2	161:15 170:21	169:19
89:21 90:7,18	Oliveri 101:11	242:17 246:3	179:10,12,12	participated
90:19 91:2,3	omit 31:13	246:20 267:3	179:15,12,12	12:18 50:22
91:12 92:7	once 36:16	ordinary 263:23	200:14,24	53:5 74:11
95:9,20 97:11	57:21 139:12	organization	206:12 232:19	227:17
98:7,16 100:7	161:6 173:1	84:9,11,13,19	240:13 242:5	participating
103:4,10,10	225:11	84:24 140:10	273:23 274:3	165:21 204:18
103.4,10,10	ones 12:2,11	196:4	275:7,18 276:6	participation
110:3,7 111:17	23:6 25:3	organizations	pages 83:19	59:25
111:21,22	77:16 91:19,20	144:20	208:15	particular 96:19
113:20 116:23	101:15 127:24	orientation	paid 30:8,11,12	96:24 102:6
117:2,24	180:10 199:12	196:12	30:15,23,24	108:5 115:15
122:11,21	219:18 253:16	original 5:1,1,3	31:2 32:2 33:5	140:23 210:22
123:22 124:6,6	253:17 267:5	42:17 215:23	40:23 160:16	212:24 223:2
124:18,25	one's 154:23	282:1	171:21	225:5 230:5
125:1 127:21	200:4	Ottman 17:18	Panzer 52:24	244:6 262:9
127:21 129:9	ongoing 68:7	57:4 58:15,19	56:2,3 66:13	273:6
129:17 130:11	173:23	58:23 61:21	paper 20:17	particularly
130:20 131:14	open 84:18,25	71:12 78:5	33:16 62:25	84:17 93:3,4
131:23 132:11	154:23 217:20	117:3 139:2	63:1,3	105:25 218:2
132:19,24	217:24 236:15	159:9,20	paragraph	parties 13:22
134:18 138:10	266:21	171:11 174:15	130:11,15	17:14 41:18
138:16 142:2	opened 266:5,7	175:22 188:13	140:13 176:2	74:18 153:9
143:6,23	operated 57:1	193:25 207:10	176:15 177:8	partisan 239:8
144:17 145:7	59:16	208:20,23,25	185:20,22,24	partner 40:19
150:13,15	operates 57:1	209:8 221:7	258:5	40:25 58:11
153:1,11	operation 51:15	276:12	paragraphs	partners 200:21
154:14 155:11	operative 80:6	ought 211:10	186:5	parts 269:15
157:13 161:13	opinion 92:12	245:23	pardon 223:7	party 36:5 44:11
163:2,6 164:7	92:12 102:6	outcome 36:24	250:18	50:3 57:9
166:4,25	108:18 201:16	239:8	paren 125:10,11	59:21 77:21
170:25 171:7	204:1 218:18	outset 161:23	parens 188:18	95:6 174:16,17
175:16,17,19	250:12,18,25	outside 95:16	Paris 202:10	174:23 199:21
180:8 184:3,16	252:1	124:6 173:15	part 10:5 11:23	211:7
188:2 190:10	opinions 48:20	overcharge	30:10 39:7	pass 232:8
191:18 200:2,4	191:8	177:19,20	55:22 69:5	passage 10:18
200:18 206:5	opportunity	overcome 272:9	76:21 78:19	117:9 120:15
206:16 208:5	138:15 154:21	272:10,14	79:18 92:9	passed 117:14
208:16 214:15	215:12 216:7	overkill 142:8	115:7,8 128:23	120:22,23
226:17 227:14	218:5 223:13	242:13	135:22 148:12	151:25
231:10 232:21	242:20 245:24	overlay 150:7	148:13 155:8	passing 124:11
240:17 250:12	248:1	owned 60:18,24	159:17 162:10	Patrick 3:13 7:1
251:11 252:5	opposed 17:4	61:2,4,20	162:13,15	69:20 93:12,14
252:10,18,19	71:22 87:24	ownership 52:7	165:3 166:19	95:8 150:1
253:8,13,20,20	option 126:13	o'clock 3:2	174:16 202:19	237:11 281:3
256:7 263:1	130:19 196:23	280:9	203:9 204:21	patterns 270:25
264:18 266:5	197:2,6		209:3 211:20	271:19 272:6
269:13 273:25	options 196:16	P	212:1 228:21	PAUL 2:4
274:24 276:1,6	196:22 197:11	P 2:5 3:3,3 6:1	228:24 230:13	pause 149:16
				<u> </u>

	Γ	Γ	Γ	
pay 152:19	percentages	Peter 3:7,9 6:22	48:5 66:23	238:15,19,24
173:14	9:10 141:4	9:1 18:5 22:12	75:3,9,10 79:3	239:23 241:15
payback 183:22	246:20 255:15	25:25 36:18	80:4 83:5 94:7	241:25 243:7
payment 33:6	276:20,23	41:6 65:25	96:22 101:1	246:10,21
173:2	Perez 2:8 101:5	69:2 81:6 87:2	103:4,20	247:16 249:7
payments	106:25 122:18	90:7 108:3	105:15 106:1	253:1 258:17
173:12	123:1 126:12	121:16 122:8	106:25 107:15	259:4,20
pays 30:10	130:18,22	192:9 208:11	121:6,17 122:9	260:25 261:11
PDF 20:18	131:15,24	257:25 280:22	131:16,21	264:3,7,16,20
Pedro 99:21	133:10,19,23	280:24	141:25 142:18	265:1,13,15
100:15,17	134:7 135:15	Peters 6:3	142:21 160:11	266:11 267:14
101:9,10 215:2	136:12,18,20	PETRI 2:4	160:25 164:6	267:21 268:3,6
271:14	257:19	phone 13:14	167:22 168:3	268:23,25
pejorative 65:9	perform 245:6	85:18,19	169:21 171:23	280:21
65:15,18	performed 21:2	133:25 202:9	172:8,17,18	polarized 271:1
pending 6:10,16	period 30:5 51:6	250:23 252:3	173:8 174:17	271:12,20
126:24 127:6	51:25 74:21	phrase 19:14	177:9 182:17	272:6,9
280:13	96:15 107:2	194:11	189:20 195:23	policy 154:15
people 8:9 16:1	110:4 126:14	piece 39:25	196:8 197:24	political 16:15
17:7,19,24	141:14 189:22	151:2,3	199:21 203:23	92:19 114:6,8
48:21 50:14	190:21 198:22	pieces 99:3,13	204:2,9,10,24	Polk 174:5
54:23 66:14	207:19 208:9	275:18	208:6 223:10	polled 158:3
74:5,16 75:15	208:12 227:1	pitfall 218:13	233:16 247:5	poor 18:12
75:16 86:3	permutations	place 72:15	255:13	pop 255:8,9
101:18,25	43:22	117:2 118:18	pointed 19:9	populated 148:3
112:14 119:8	person 48:23	215:15 222:22	74:4	population 8:11
121:24 123:8	73:22 75:5	282:2	pointing 145:3	8:22 9:10
123:21 147:15	99:15 103:5,21	placed 249:22	207:4 221:22	10:15 11:7
148:3 153:19	106:22 123:6,7	plaintiffs 1:9	222:16	92:9 118:15
153:20,20,22	123:19 165:12	2:10,20 3:6,10	points 98:19	153:12,16,21
158:25 159:24	197:20,21	6:8,13,20,22	Poland 3:6 4:4,6	214:18,19
165:11 175:21	246:14	6:24 7:11	6:23,24 79:15	215:1 217:4,14
175:22 177:18	personal 55:19	158:4,5 237:17	157:21 158:2,3	223:14 242:17
188:9 194:8	114:25 149:15	238:8 247:22	158:15,19	243:23,24
198:11,12,25	162:18 202:19	248:6 257:24	165:24 166:7	244:20 245:2
211:13 226:19	personally	280:11,15,21	170:6,13,17	245:18,25
226:25 249:2	144:14 151:10	280:25	175:5,11,16,18	246:4,5 252:20
257:19	157:4,5 160:13	plan 64:14	178:15 179:3	255:20 256:4
Perales 110:20	160:14 270:14	126:21 127:18	181:13 183:17	populations
113:9 196:6	person's 255:4	130:22 218:16	184:9,15 188:1	91:25 148:16
249:21	perspective	231:25	188:7 193:14	149:1 195:12
percent 118:9	53:12 149:10	plane 51:3	200:9,10	222:2,9,25
118:14 119:10	156:22,25,25	189:11,13	202:24 203:5	223:1,7,10
142:8,9,10,13	162:17,18	plead 220:20	204:5 205:19	241:5,10 250:7
142:15,20	214:17 216:20	please 6:19	205:23 212:6	Port 182:8,9
143:11,16	216:20 219:9	14:14,24 78:9	214:13 221:12	portion 150:19
144:1 148:11	224:8 238:11	80:21 125:2	221:18 226:18	201:3
153:5 214:25	238:20,21	126:5 132:8,15	227:8,22 228:5	position 44:17
221:22 225:17	239:12	175:19 179:6	228:10,18	66:12 95:13
241:6,6,7	persuade 276:14	184:3 185:10	229:4,13,22	108:25 123:22
242:7 243:21	276:16	200:17,19	230:9,24 231:4	128:22 130:8
244:20 255:8,8	pertain 9:10	201:7 221:11	231:14 232:6	possession
255:9,9,21	95:3	232:12,19	232:10 233:8	15:16 16:5
256:5 271:9,21	pertained 98:24	233:6 240:6	233:21 234:8	22:21 24:1,14
percentage	136:24	248:1	234:16,22	possibilities
222:16 234:13	pertaining 202:3	plus 26:14	235:3,12	198:21 241:3
242:17 243:23	pertains 95:4	point 8:13 13:1	236:12,17,24	possibility
255:23,24	Pesky 67:19	19:5 39:16	237:3,10	119:18 120:5

121:1	196:23 197:16	222:23 224:17	75:16 76:13,16	production 24:3
possible 15:21	231:21 232:2	229:2 271:6,7	77:2 81:24	professional
90:22 118:13	presentation	private 179:17	82:4,22 83:1	1:22 2:23
121:12 125:25	198:3	179:19	87:19 88:14	202:20 280:4
129:18 215:25	presented 49:13	privilege 12:10	89:22 92:8	professor 75:25
216:3 218:4	151:11,20	15:7 29:18	96:22,23 98:4	76:1,5 77:10
post 124:2	196:17,22,24	93:21 141:8	98:10,20	77:11 78:5
potential 53:13	197:4,12,15	162:4,6,11,14	101:23 102:7	79:2,20 81:17
104:9 110:18	presently	266:22	102:13 105:25	82:7,12,18,21
127:17 186:3,7	150:11	privileged 69:25	107:15 109:18	83:17 84:2,9
218:12	press 55:20	140:25 141:9	112:17 117:16	85:12 86:4,19
potentially	136:24 137:3,8	200:8	117:17,20,21	107:14,17
15:11 181:24	137:8 139:7	probably 12:22	117:25 118:5	108:5,22 109:3
203:7 219:2	140:9 240:13	35:16,17 48:20	120:7 136:20	109:11 110:1,9
265:22	240:20 258:3	54:18 75:14	137:11 139:15	112:7,22 113:5
practical 96:20	prestige 130:8	76:3 87:2	139:17 141:15	113:23 150:6
105:24 121:19	presumably	93:14 104:19	146:3 151:18	168:11 169:1,5
214:4 262:18	16:12 17:13,13	119:11 122:19	158:9 160:1	169:8,9 171:25
practically 43:5	17:21 24:21	130:23 133:24	161:23 164:19	172:4,22
practice 182:11 182:16,20	30:6,19,23 131:21 133:23	140:12 158:12 167:9 190:17	165:13,22 169:20 172:7	177:22 190:1
practitioners	194:6 204:18	191:13 202:9	173:22,22	190:11,25 191:7,18,24
18:14	208:6	203:14 209:17	173.22,22	192:3,17,22
precedent 52:18	presume 63:22	232:24 237:24	179:24 187:13	193:9 200:22
52:20	pretrial 247:22	260:7	187:15 190:3	202:12,17
precise 45:1,11	248:6	problem 47:4	193:10 196:20	203:14 246:15
61:13 98:16	pretty 29:1	121:23 142:6	198:6 203:9	250:10 260:4
132:13 215:14	75:13,13 77:17	209:1,13,14	204:22 207:7	programs 60:25
227:16	88:8 112:6	242:6,11 243:5	209:24 210:13	progress 11:3
precisely 15:21	116:2 138:4	243:16 245:17	211:5,17,23	102:13
60:16 210:11	186:13 199:8	problems 121:22	216:17 223:22	prohibitively
precision 19:24	273:23	Procedure 2:22	227:2,5 228:22	237:24
43:15	previous 163:12	proceeded 50:20	228:24 230:13	projects 171:24
predicate 62:3,5	181:19 211:4	proceedings	230:14 239:3	proper 65:12
predicated	previously	204:16 225:19	249:5 252:2	81:5
136:12	121:15 148:2	232:17 237:4	256:21 257:23	properly 130:9
predictable	162:21 166:2	281:20	258:9 259:6	proposal 255:17
149:6	168:20 176:11	process 8:16,24	261:19 262:7	258:25 259:16
predicted 245:7	191:16 200:12	11:24 12:19,21	262:11,18,21	259:17 273:10
predominantly	245:20 248:16	13:3 16:8,16	262:23 263:1,9	276:2,3
148:2 237:20	primarily 72:17	16:20,23 17:12	263:15,16,20	proposals 33:3
premier 250:4,4 250:4	84:15 209:12 219:9	19:11 20:5,13 21:25 22:11,23	263:21,23 265:23	197:3,7 198:7 211:10 275:24
preparation	primary 25:16	23:9 24:16	procured 80:8	propose 255:7
141:1,19	91:19,20	25:13,15,17,24	produce 16:2,11	proposed 150:11
prepare 134:10	printed 144:4	26:8 30:25	17:23	241:4 256:8,11
167:10	prior 9:7 10:17	32:3,15 33:18	produced 12:8	256:17
prepared 17:9	23:24 35:15	34:5 37:25	15:8,15 17:3	proposition 97:3
21:20 23:25	42:23 52:22	40:13 46:8	17:15,16,22	105:22 128:11
74:7 150:5	66:9 83:18	48:19 52:15	19:12,17,18	Prosser 51:4,10
261:16	85:19 117:11	54:16 56:4,5	21:23 22:8,9	71:4 107:23
preparing 13:13	133:16 136:18	57:23 58:21	22:13,20 24:16	189:13
141:12,14	136:19 137:14	59:11,20,23	25:10 136:21	Prosser's 190:9
167:23	139:14 143:1	60:3 62:2,9,13	producing 18:23	protection
present 10:11	167:3 182:5	63:8,21,22,24	product 15:11	192:12
109:2 119:2,3	203:16 209:24	68:3 71:16	98:10 141:9	provide 13:8,11
147:10 149:8	214:23 217:23	72:25 73:2,3	151:20 178:7	22:15 24:8
190:15,18	221:25 222:19	73:17 74:3	208:4	25:1 32:16

				Page 300
131:18 176:19	125:1 138:25	230:11,25	12:11 167:6	**** 202.6 8 16
I .		231:15 233:9		reads 223:6,8,16
222:3 223:17	149:19,22		250:2	240:19 241:1
251:3	178:20 179:2	233:23,25	RAMIREZ 2:9	255:6
provided 17:10	179:13 206:15	234:2 238:18	RAMIRO 2:8	ready 132:1,3,5
22:15 24:3,7	212:9,12	239:22 241:11	ran 25:18	263:22 268:23
31:8,10,20	220:16,19	241:16,24	range 217:10	real 119:18
58:16 59:10	254:18 272:19	242:3 245:10	rare 23:19	136:1
61:1 131:20	272:24 274:4	245:22 256:14	rate 31:25 36:19	reality 49:25
222:24 251:10	275:22 276:7	256:25 260:12	87:25 270:7	realize 130:4
251:12,13,23	277:5 279:18	266:12,21	rates 152:9	really 32:22
255:18	279:19	267:15 268:7	269:14	84:19 115:24
providing 14:11	P.O 3:16 281:6	270:16 272:14	Ray 13:16 48:25	149:15 174:3
provision 43:2		278:18,24	49:21 75:17,19	200:13,23
provisions 2:21	Q	questioned	77:9 78:6	realtors 180:16
proximity	qualified 43:8	54:24	88:18,21 90:2	reapportionm
230:18	43:10,21	questioning	117:4 130:25	69:23 161:18
prudent 237:19	qualify 91:13	236:18 247:15	131:2,4 168:3	reason 33:20
public 2:23	queries 21:12	249:1	209:12,17	39:15,21 42:9
50:24 128:21	26:21	questions 10:2	276:12	43:21 45:22
130:8 141:12		12:15 19:7,9	Raymond 88:19	47:12 49:17,18
	query 21:3,8,10	•	209:25	· ·
176:17 178:3	question 8:21	19:14 26:14,21		66:18 80:1
197:4,8 205:11	8:22 9:9 10:4,9	49:8 55:5	Ray's 209:20	82:6 97:2
229:3 231:24	10:14,21,25	75:24 95:25	reach 169:5	102:2 112:13
263:4,22 280:4	11:5 18:25	144:19 175:12	202:13 249:25	152:18 160:18
282:6	19:14 20:6	198:15 206:2	257:9 260:3,3	164:23 177:17
publicly 50:22	23:23 24:11	212:19,20	reached 249:2	189:16 221:25
125:3 277:19	33:12 39:6	223:20,24	256:20,22	222:18
published	41:9 43:25	236:3 240:9	257:3,11	reasonable 7:19
131:21	44:19 45:8	246:24 248:11	258:12,20	95:7 111:11
pull 36:13	47:2 51:13	248:20 249:16	268:13	131:9 147:10
purpose 129:10	52:9 66:21,22	252:16 257:1	reaching 258:7	154:21 185:16
136:5 169:5	69:10 73:10	261:18 262:21	react 148:5	185:19
177:4 189:5	79:17 90:5,6	264:1 265:12	reacting 118:12	reasonably 8:5
204:14	90:11,19 92:15	265:17,19	reactions 207:1	128:1
purposely	93:7 95:12,18	266:6 267:17	read 55:3 62:25	reasons 50:7
176:16 177:6	96:25 97:1	268:1,14 273:3	63:1,2 64:20	129:16 131:8
183:19	98:19 99:3	quick 48:7	66:7 67:3,8	153:24 162:2,5
purposes 109:20	102:1,9,10	quickly 66:21	69:9,17,19,21	177:11 189:8
120:5 129:12	103:9,11	75:13 118:6	80:18 81:16	recall 10:19,20
129:13 257:21	104:17,18	quite 49:25 70:6	82:15 103:13	11:13 20:23
pursuant 2:21	109:1,6 114:7	70:23 190:6	103:16,18	21:11 23:1,13
15:3 267:3	120:3 128:7	211:8 222:24	104:20,21	23:14,16,20
put 34:9 48:5	141:5 149:3	quizzical 130:24	105:14 119:15	27:21 28:19
80:6 84:20	153:13 155:2	quotes 117:17	124:17,24	29:13 31:11
114:11,23	161:22 164:13		125:1,18	33:7 34:18,19
125:4 145:25	166:15,23,25	R	126:22 130:4	34:19 43:25
153:3 155:20	167:1,6,12	R 1:19 2:19 3:3	130:11,24	51:10,25 58:25
163:24 176:7,8	173:4 176:24	4:3 6:1,5 7:10	134:4,25 142:2	59:2,12 62:21
186:15	176:25 181:19	87:12 178:19	142:14 148:9	64:9,11,11
puts 62:13	185:18,23	179:1 186:24	164:21 170:19	66:14,16,17
putting 19:3	192:18 200:1	272:18,23	220:20,22	69:15 72:2,15
97:9 108:6	202:1 204:10	279:17 280:6	221:11 233:6	73:5,8 74:15
145:5 156:5	214:8 216:8	280:18	233:11,24	78:18 81:1,2
p.m 6:6 48:11	218:20 220:21	racial 147:22	234:3 235:24	91:4 105:19
48:14 87:8,13	221:13 222:12	racially 271:1	reading 97:17	107:25 110:14
107:9,12	225:1 227:9,23	271:19 272:6,9	116:13 119:23	116:25 135:1
116:19,22	228:6,11,19	raise 275:5	125:20 140:1	137:14,15,24
117:5 124:16	229:5,23	raised 8:25	188:4 236:19	138:2,2 139:19

	1	T	T	I
159:4,12	164:20 168:10	recount 51:5,5	173:22 179:25	71:6 94:9
164:12,17	170:5 184:12	71:5 107:23	187:2 189:2,5	176:10 208:17
184:24 185:4	186:13,19	190:9	190:3,8 191:4	225:18 264:10
186:11 187:8	190:4,20,22	red 70:3 150:17	191:9 193:10	268:12 275:14
190:1,10 191:2	193:6 195:20	150:20	203:9,16	reflected 27:18
191:3,7,20	198:4 226:24	redistrict 91:24	204:14,21	29:19 31:6
192:17,20,21	236:2 244:18	redistricted	211:4,16	35:22 167:2,5
192:22,25	249:20	92:10 111:4	223:12,21	177:7 196:2
193:2,8 195:1	recommendat	114:5 241:12	224:11,23	208:9 215:18
195:3,24 196:5	34:18,23 36:2	redistricting	228:21 231:25	216:19 242:1
196:9,16,20	recommendat	7:21,24 8:4,16	240:24 244:5	254:21 265:25
201:11,25	35:18	10:6,17 12:19	244:12 245:13	281:21
202:1 205:7,8	recommended	12:20 13:3	247:18 249:5	reflecting 22:22
205:9,14,17,18	165:12 247:11	16:8,16,20,23	250:5 251:20	reflection 20:1
207:3,9,12,14	reconfigure	17:12 20:5	257:23 263:24	reflects 20:10
207:16 208:23	121:13 214:2	21:25 22:11,23	265:23	39:11 208:18
209:7,10 215:2	reconfigured 246:3	23:9 24:15	redo 105:6	257:13,18
217:5,12,19		25:13,15,17,24	122:16	refresh 69:6
225:9 226:17	reconfiguring 121:3	26:4,8 32:3,7	redrawing 119:17 121:1	184:12 192:3
227:14 229:1,7 233:12 234:3,7	record 20:10	33:18 37:25 40:12 46:7	209:2	refreshed 236:2 refreshes 37:20
233:12 234:3,7	48:11,14 50:24	48:19 50:11	reduce 246:3	69:12
234.14,20	61:5,19 67:21	52:15,23 54:15	reelected	refreshing 236:2
236:8 245:16	69:5 71:6	56:4 58:20	246:20	regard 20:21
249:18 251:11	80:18 81:16	59:11 60:2	refer 173:21	24:9 26:3
257:3 265:16	87:6,8 94:9	62:2,9,12	176:24 185:5	35:22 47:4
265:19 270:17	100:5 103:18	63:16 66:11	188:23 206:8	62:15 67:10
270:23 272:3	104:21 107:9	68:3 71:1 73:3	reference 66:9	92:1 114:19
recalls 236:20	107:12 109:10	73:11,23 74:8	85:24 108:22	197:3 210:16
receive 13:5	116:15,19,20	74:17 76:12,21	171:25	243:1 245:4
228:13	116:22 119:16	76:23 77:1	references	250:2 267:7,9
received 13:14	125:2 127:11	87:19 88:14	185:13	268:10
13:25 14:1,2	130:12 134:5	89:2,8,22	referred 43:10	regarding 24:1
15:17 42:4,7	142:3 149:17	91:21 92:8	55:9 179:19	24:15 37:24
82:4 83:1,5	149:19,22	96:18 97:4	193:24 196:18	73:6 108:18
139:11 227:6	178:17,21	98:20 101:23	199:10 221:20	137:1 187:7
228:9 275:23	184:1 203:4	102:1,13 103:6	222:6 249:23	193:19 248:11
receiving 139:11	212:7,9,12	103:21 104:12	referring 25:3	251:4 257:4
139:19 205:15	220:16,17,19	104:23 105:25	26:24 68:5	regards 10:21
recess 48:12	220:22 221:11	107:1,15	117:18,23	22:11 32:16
87:9 107:10	225:18 233:6	109:24 110:10	119:25 120:2	137:11 145:18
149:20 212:10	233:11,19,24	110:19,22	129:3 155:13	267:4
recognize 66:4	235:24,25	111:2 112:7,9	163:23 164:13	region 195:5,6
116:9 147:16	236:19 247:25	113:6,23	167:1,9 168:8	regional 190:19
158:24,25	248:2,14	117:25 119:20	169:16 173:6,7	194:15,20
159:3 171:1	264:10,17,21	126:20 127:18	181:19 194:5	197:22 198:7
183:22 185:17	265:4,6 266:4	130:22 136:20	194:14 196:11	208:2
recognized	266:13,15,19	137:1,11 144:5	199:14 210:24	regions 191:1
122:3	267:11 268:12	144:10,17,21	219:11 222:19	Registered 1:22
recollect 135:15	268:15 272:20	145:7,10,18,22	223:3 242:7,10	2:23 280:3
recollection	275:1,14 278:2	146:13 157:11	242:24,25	regular 30:17
23:5 37:20	281:20	158:9 159:9,14	243:17 255:2,4	50:14 73:19
39:17 42:8	recordkeeping	159:20,25	255:12 258:10	regularly 23:11
69:7,13 107:18	12:16	163:23 164:3	271:14 273:10	regulations
115:25 116:1	records 84:18	164:19 165:3	277:6	216:22
130:21 136:22	160:19	165:13,16,20	refers 48:2	REID 2:4
138:23 146:4	record's 70:7	168:19 169:6	163:11 173:2	Reinhart 3:11
154:19 164:5	127:6	169:19 172:7	reflect 33:10	7:2 32:22
I	I	1	I	1

34:25 35:4,11	11:4 21:1	247:22 248:6	request 14:9	resulted 158:10
35:14,19 36:5	28:22,25 29:4	277:18	15:17,22 20:1	196:11
37:14,24 38:22	29:4,22,22	reporter 1:22	22:17 25:11	results 271:6
39:12,18 40:3	30:3,4,14	2:23 7:8	51:3 150:6	retain 224:20
40:12,23 41:1	33:23 35:8,9	158:21 170:18	236:3 247:3,10	retained 28:1
42:19 44:23	35:16,20,21	175:6 179:4	requested 15:24	43:20 44:1
45:18,25 46:22	36:1,12 37:6	184:20 193:15	16:4,13,24	50:17,21 51:9
47:6,9 57:6	43:23 49:16,16	205:24 265:2	20:16 22:14	109:12,19
93:10 94:16	56:12 59:6	280:4	23:1 247:1	141:15 158:8
182:5 183:3,10	76:24 85:7	Reporting 6:3	requests 15:19	159:13,16,21
185:6 281:1	104:7 106:17	282:22	15:20	160:14,16,20
Reinhart's 36:4	112:21 113:15	reports 34:15	required 62:7	161:8 165:13
44:17,21 46:7	113:16 115:14	163:16 206:19	residence	171:22,23
relate 55:5	115:22 116:3	206:22	113:14,15	173:15 187:6
59:15 84:14	119:7 124:23	represent 11:22	residency 91:17	203:25 204:8
related 8:16	135:8 138:10	18:19 44:12	resolved 10:3	224:14 225:6
10:6 11:8,23	145:12 155:2,4	51:4,10 70:16	59:24 64:15	266:18
12:9,20 13:2	160:10,12,19	109:10 153:9	130:9	retainer 28:5
13:22 15:25	164:22 168:25	155:7 158:4	respect 26:3	29:6,11 33:6
16:6 20:13,20	177:3 179:21	161:16 171:16		34:10 35:24
			44:16 55:19,22	
21:13,23 22:6	180:10,11,11	212:17 230:21	89:15 114:18	36:8
22:9 50:22	180:12,19,20	232:16 265:4	161:16 217:13	retention 16:24
69:22 89:22	189:21,25	representation	237:8 238:8	23:21 29:15,23
139:19 268:14	191:12,13	47:10 81:21	respected 204:1	30:7,14 47:6
270:20	194:16 196:8	82:1 109:16	respective 28:2	47:13 56:16
relating 161:17	199:19 200:5	161:18 162:7	28:9 46:20	153:6 158:11
210:3 268:1	203:13 205:10	187:5 244:9	162:9 171:17	160:7 166:16
relationship	207:5 212:5	representatio	respectively	166:23 167:4,8
_		74:25	175:23 241:5	*
8:21 29:20	214:9 234:4			167:19 172:1,9
54:21 63:17	273:16,18	representative	respects 204:2	172:13 175:10
		_		
77:11 117:9	remembered	23:17 92:23	246:6	176:5,12 177:2
77:11 117:9 177:9	remembered 44:9	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15	246:6 respond 81:1	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14
77:11 117:9	remembered	23:17 92:23	246:6	176:5,12 177:2
77:11 117:9 177:9	remembered 44:9	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15	246:6 respond 81:1	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13	remembered 44:9 remembers	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23 remained 50:11	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8 53:9	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12 Republicans	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3 98:4	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8 77:20 78:23
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23 remained 50:11 remains 119:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8 53:9 reply 85:21	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12 Republicans 74:22 75:11	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3 98:4 result 18:7 32:2	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8 77:20 78:23 Rick 76:6 81:14
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23 remained 50:11 remains 119:18 121:1	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8 53:9 reply 85:21 report 85:25	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12 Republicans 74:22 75:11 211:9	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3 98:4 result 18:7 32:2 136:9 139:21	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8 77:20 78:23 Rick 76:6 81:14 81:17,18 82:13
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23 remained 50:11 remains 119:18 121:1 remap 101:18	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8 53:9 reply 85:21 report 85:25 86:5 145:17	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12 Republicans 74:22 75:11 211:9 reputation	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3 98:4 result 18:7 32:2 136:9 139:21 142:16 147:23	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8 77:20 78:23 Rick 76:6 81:14 81:17,18 82:13 Rick's 85:19
77:11 117:9 177:9 relationships 39:20 203:13 relative 16:2,6 17:10 19:10 48:4 95:15 96:2 102:15,16 102:23 104:14 104:25 141:13 223:3 281:18 relatively 54:18 102:13 139:14 release 139:7 140:9 240:14 240:20 258:3 relevance 65:21 91:21 relevant 175:14 relieved 267:6,8 rely 20:3 remain 186:8 210:25 215:23 remained 50:11 remains 119:18 121:1	remembered 44:9 remembers 235:23 remind 22:2 27:23 62:24 reminds 146:1 remove 274:7,11 274:12,22,25 removed 274:20 275:16 renamed 155:10 renowned 203:17 rented 53:1 rep 221:23 repeat 161:6 repeatedly 110:9 118:19 rephrase 59:18 98:18 243:16 269:21 replicated 53:8 53:9 reply 85:21 report 85:25	23:17 92:23 154:24 180:15 199:18 215:13 215:16,24 218:5,9 232:21 242:18 representatives 180:14 216:4 223:14 242:21 244:22 246:1 represented 35:3 52:23 236:25 representing 8:8 44:13 46:18 48:18 251:9 reps 221:23 222:17 Republican 26:23 44:2,2 44:24 63:23 160:8 237:21 238:12 Republicans 74:22 75:11 211:9	246:6 respond 81:1 122:5 167:14 responded 140:20 responding 83:17 192:20 275:22 response 14:8 83:25 140:24 161:21 173:4 255:17 274:17 responsibility 22:16 77:25 responsible 126:5 165:2,5 responsive 15:17,19 25:10 rest 89:12 137:13,19 171:2 182:19 restore 36:25 restriction 98:3 98:4 result 18:7 32:2 136:9 139:21	176:5,12 177:2 177:5 186:6,14 186:16 204:10 204:13 retentions 171:20 retiring 174:7 retrograde 215:5 reveals 178:7 reverse 163:3 166:8 211:12 231:20 review 20:17 30:19 35:14 37:19 38:14 138:15 248:16 251:6,6,22 reviewed 12:12 20:17 38:15 rhetorical 65:9 RIBBLE 2:5 Richard 1:5,8 77:20 78:23 Rick 76:6 81:14 81:17,18 82:13

				-
21:9 25:19	23:2 24:13	101:5 108:20	81:19 83:22	188:12,21
32:11 33:13	199:18	113:15 119:9	90:19 129:8	191:18,22
37:6,10 39:10	ROBSON 1:5	122:12 222:21	130:10 131:23	192:15 194:2,4
46:11 49:12	ROCHELLE 1:5	234:20 235:1	134:23 142:12	194:11 199:7
52:14 54:11,14	Rodriguez 101:7	235:10 236:8	144:1 149:16	200:24 201:7,8
•				
54:17,17 55:25	101:8 106:10	239:9 246:19	154:21 166:14	204:16 206:20
68:19 80:6	106:18,20	275:17 276:13	179:15 184:11	207:7 208:3
83:21 85:10	117:22 257:19	278:7	184:25 189:8	209:5 240:15
86:11 87:4,5	ROGERS 1:5	says 38:20 39:16	200:24 206:12	240:18 273:8
88:7,11 89:5	role 71:1 102:7	42:5 69:24	215:9,25	275:12 276:14
89:14,18 90:25	109:18,19	78:22 80:19	222:14 223:8	seeing 28:19
94:14 96:13	112:12 160:22	128:23 129:1	240:12 253:15	29:4 69:15
100:15,16	160:24 204:19	129:21 133:22	258:5 275:7,18	184:24
102:8 108:6	209:20 213:2	142:3 161:15	277:5	seek 30:18
110:3 113:11	226:17	163:14,15	second-to-last	76:12 89:23,23
113:17 124:6	RON 1:6	164:25 165:1	177:8	seeking 191:7
125:5,16,19	RONALD 1:4,10	179:15 180:23	secrecy 58:20	204:6 223:20
126:3,21	room 67:22	186:4 192:11	58:24 59:4,9	250:12,18,19
129:15 130:10	86:20	201:3,24	60:4,8 61:25	seen 22:17
134:16 137:17	rose 70:3,4	203:18 275:7	62:8,20 63:11	28:18,25 29:3
139:9,23 142:2	roughly 70:25	schedule 51:24	63:13 64:8,20	37:5 56:19
143:8 144:11	round 201:15	81:18 88:3	64:22,24 66:14	62:20 69:7,13
146:10 147:19	row 235:22	scheduling	66:25 67:9,13	86:21 150:2
149:24 151:11	rule 233:20	193:20	68:3,8 70:2	184:22 188:2
152:2 153:1,4	248:14 267:9	SCHLIEPP 1:6	72:6	191:19 202:16
153:6,14	rules 2:21 67:20	school 76:19,22	secret 60:22	208:5
154:12 155:16	216:21 267:4	202:16	65:2,7,10,15	selected 127:23
155:17 159:12	run 119:8	science 92:19	65:16,18 72:12	sell 182:19
163:5,11,22	157:22	92:19	72:21,25 81:4	senate 27:6 28:3
164:20 171:5	running 86:16	scope 37:22	81:9 263:3	38:23 40:7
171:14 172:2,3	133:3	111:18 187:5	secretive 227:4	43:11,20 44:21
177:4 183:4	RYAN 2:4	187:11 246:22	228:17,21	46:1,2,3,4,8,9
193:22,23,25		246:25 247:6	229:19 231:10	46:18 95:16
200:4 201:24	S	247:14 268:17	section 152:3	96:3,7,9 98:22
202:10 210:15	S 3:3,17 4:8 6:1	Scott 16:20,22	241:1	99:1 104:7,8
224:24 227:6	280:18 281:7	17:1,11,18	see 14:13 28:20	118:10,14,20
230:20 232:6	safely 199:7	20:5,14 21:10	28:20 32:5	120:12 161:7
250:25 254:12	sake 182:22	21:24 24:12	37:4,19 46:6	161:16 162:8
254:15 261:5	salient 91:15	25:14,15 38:24	55:3 64:23	171:16 186:24
275:21 276:9	salt 178:5	40:8 43:12	87:3,5 104:19	192:5,23 193:3
277:10	SANCHEZ-BELL	44:22 52:24	126:12 130:18	194:6,9,10
rights 195:14	1:6	53:18 54:15,19	132:18 134:3	216:7,13,15
224:5 239:4,11	Sandals 94:5	55:19 72:23	140:2 142:10	210.7,13,13
244.5 239.4,11	Sandals 94:5 Sandisk 50:18	106:18,20	143:7,21	senator 21:1
ripple 95:16		124:1 161:8	148:22,24,24	23:3,4,8,10
	167:24	186:24 199:16		24:13 27:14
96:17,20 97:25 98:25 102:23	Sarah 78:6	Scott's 53:10	150:20 155:12 156:16 159:6	
	200:21 201:11	Sealed 4:24		29:18,19 56:2
103:7,22 104:9	sat 149:11 233:4		161:18 163:19	56:3 163:12,16
	264:11	SEAN 2:5	164:10 166:12 166:15 167:14	199:17
104:16 105:2	sotisfied 101.14		1 100:13 107:14	senators 50:23
105:11,21	satisfied 121:14	search 17:6 20:4		sand //·11
105:11,21 106:7 153:25	Saturday 93:15	20:13 21:2	167:16 168:6	send 44:11
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8	125:8,10,22
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19	125:8,10,22 201:11
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5 Rivas 125:10	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24 144:15 189:7	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10 21:7 22:3,4	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19 176:2,20	125:8,10,22 201:11 sending 171:11
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5 Rivas 125:10 126:17 127:15	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24 144:15 189:7 199:14 225:10	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10 21:7 22:3,4 seat 215:1	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19 176:2,20 177:12 179:17	125:8,10,22 201:11 sending 171:11 176:4
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5 Rivas 125:10 126:17 127:15 128:9 129:3	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24 144:15 189:7 199:14 225:10 saying 18:13	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10 21:7 22:3,4 seat 215:1 217:19,20,24	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19 176:2,20 177:12 179:17 183:25 185:1,9	125:8,10,22 201:11 sending 171:11 176:4 senior 49:1 88:6
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5 Rivas 125:10 126:17 127:15 128:9 129:3 274:18 275:23	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24 144:15 189:7 199:14 225:10 saying 18:13 23:15 28:23	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10 21:7 22:3,4 seat 215:1 217:19,20,24 second 48:8	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19 176:2,20 177:12 179:17 183:25 185:1,9 185:11,21	125:8,10,22 201:11 sending 171:11 176:4 senior 49:1 88:6 88:9,24 89:9
105:11,21 106:7 153:25 198:14 276:24 RISSEEUW 1:5 Rivas 125:10 126:17 127:15 128:9 129:3	Saturday 93:15 93:23 181:16 saw 29:24 144:15 189:7 199:14 225:10 saying 18:13	20:13 21:2 22:5 25:5 searched 20:10 21:7 22:3,4 seat 215:1 217:19,20,24	167:16 168:6 169:14 170:8 171:24 173:19 176:2,20 177:12 179:17 183:25 185:1,9	125:8,10,22 201:11 sending 171:11 176:4 senior 49:1 88:6

	1		ī	_
142:23	seriously 58:10	190:12	86:25 87:4	107:17 120:4
sense 72:9 88:4	served 93:13	shows 48:1	218:9 273:17	131:6 164:24
89:6 125:24	servers 20:19	150:6 244:25	situation 215:10	182:19 207:6
154:9 171:22	service 156:8	275:8	229:1 245:22	223:19 238:4
194:21 209:14	services 31:7,10	side 45:6 63:20		
			six 119:5	250:20
238:11,18	31:20 35:1	86:22 112:12	six-month 36:21	speaker 23:18
244:4 272:11	45:25 47:6	152:25 170:7	size 194:18	27:3,13 28:9
SENSENBREN	187:11	183:8 187:18	skills 125:9	29:19 30:11,21
2:4	serving 203:8	191:15 216:18	126:4 192:9	33:4,22 34:1
sensitive 95:24	session 159:17	226:20 251:4	skipped 140:12	34:21 36:10
96:11,14,22	set 35:24 61:7	sides 63:23	slightly 47:1	38:25 40:9
97:1 98:2,21	61:10 73:11	73:25 211:14	217:6 256:7,9	43:13 44:13
sensitivity	161:1 162:20	sign 29:6 40:25	slings 74:7	49:11,13 52:17
102:10	165:19 170:6	58:24 59:4,9	slow 183:20	54:25 55:23
sent 5:3 16:19	173:13 174:25	61:25 62:7	small 50:9	56:9 57:11
16:21 17:19	183:8 187:18	64:8 66:14	social 92:19	75:8 164:15,17
110:17 117:3	191:15	67:13 68:3	156:8	182:13,24
138:20,25	settle 200:1	signature 70:20	socialize 124:10	186:25 199:16
176:14 188:8	settled 151:24	signatures 58:7	software 119:1,4	speaking 43:5
201:14,17	210:17	signed 29:25	sole 165:17	54:18 121:2
205:6 230:22	seven 190:7	32:13 56:11,13	solve 121:22,23	159:19 164:12
231:12 252:8	264:14 273:17	58:20 63:12	268:4	164:17 193:2,8
252:22,22	seven-hour	66:22 70:18,19	somebody 77:5	Speaks 139:5
254:6 255:13	279:14	117:14 120:16	107:3 113:12	special 84:19
274:17 276:7	share 84:24	120:24	115:19 128:14	114:12
276:11,13	126:4 218:18	significant 9:4	129:2 143:21	specific 10:19
sentence 119:14	219:4,7,7	50:19 107:19	157:6 186:18	11:4 48:23
119:15 120:1	228:2,15	152:12,24	237:4	52:1 73:6
125:4,15 126:7	262:14 263:3	154:5 216:2	someone's 79:13	92:22 120:10
128:17,23	shared 86:4,6	218:1 219:1	soon 259:12	190:25 191:1,8
129:9 134:18	101:12 219:9	signing 41:19	sorry 13:19	195:4 206:7
134:22,24	219:12 229:1	64:11 117:12	44:19 69:10	207:12 222:8
164:9 168:4	Sheboygan 64:5	similar 72:12	97:11 104:17	specifically
169:13 172:23	SHEILA 1:7	simple 21:5 31:6	120:19 132:9	105:19 191:14
188:15 222:5	Shop 231:8	121:20	180:1 206:9	192:23 195:24
222:14 223:5,8	short 167:15	simply 10:20	233:21 265:13	206:2
223:16 242:13	shorter 80:23	13:20 19:4	270:4	specifics 255:17
267:16	187:19	20:14 31:6,17	sort 7:25 23:2	speculate 41:4
sentences	shorthand 282:1	34:20 39:16	54:25 208:3	41:12 57:10,12
267:16,18	shortly 158:14	45:1 51:7	sorts 11:12	76:10 89:15
separate 27:7	205:8,12	64:16 73:8	sought 18:24	154:16 181:5,6
28:20 29:6,11	shots 49:2,2	74:15 106:1	sound 197:1	181:8,10,11
109:21 114:8	show 36:14	119:17 120:9	203:21 204:7	202:6 226:4
191:11 209:4	47:15,18 67:21	124:9 130:1	sounding 203:24	speculated 61:3
230:3 254:15	68:16,24 77:13	140:5,16	204:3	speculating
sequence 30:4	116:6 124:14	152:23 156:24	source 100:6	61:17 226:6
133:3,4 170:3	148:25 170:3	174:17 177:10	127:17 165:18	speculation
200:20 210:19	219:14 220:23	200:15 230:2	south 149:13	61:15,16
277:24,25	showed 86:2	242:15 244:7	152:25 155:3	222:12
,	145:2			
sequences 278:8 series 19:7		258:1 278:12	216:18 244:7	speech 82:8 84:17
79:19 151:19	showing 14:23 28:12 37:2	single 15:16 33:6 156:7,8	251:4 255:10 273:7	speed 117:19
179:7 198:5	38:12 69:4,16	209:17 274:23	southern 272:7	spends 209:19
207:18 239:5	83:15 134:9	sir 33:19 41:5	space 50:13 53:1	spent 152:12,23
265:17 266:1	138:3 149:24	276:8	53:1 56:23	244:23
271:7,7 273:3	221:2	sit 135:17	58:5	Spindel 257:20
serious 49:22	shown 70:8	195:18 205:9	speak 77:8 93:9	spoke 23:11
93:7	86:10 154:4	sitting 18:12	99:18 107:14	26:5,7 90:20
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	l .	

				Page 311
164:9 165:21	209:18 211:11	strictly 215:11	success 80:15	81:9 89:18
202:2,8 254:25	211:24 216:5	strike 59:17	successful 80:12	90:13 101:15
spoken 26:2	216:15 249:4	98:18 102:18	239:19 245:4	103:10,14
149:2 258:20	249:12 262:6	144:18 164:12	246:7	104:4 105:3
SS 280:2	280:1,5 282:7	185:23 202:1	Suder 27:15	107:16 110:8
St 125:11	stated 45:13	217:1 222:12	199:19	110:16 112:5,6
stack's 183:12	statement 39:2	225:13 231:4	suggest 135:25	116:3,12,17
Stadtmueller	39:7,10 40:14	236:17 237:8	152:22 165:14	132:15 134:6
264:11	40:15,17 55:12	237:19 246:23	202:8	138:4,9 139:17
Stadtmueller's	89:3 91:3	247:15 252:25	suggested 77:9	141:16 150:1
247:10	96:10 121:5	253:3 258:23	118:19 128:19	154:20,22
staff 68:2	135:24 140:7	259:3,11,24	249:1 250:10	173:6 177:20
staffing 52:15	161:14 168:6	261:10 268:1,1	259:15,16	180:10,19
stage 174:1	172:24,25	272:14	suggesting	196:14 204:24
stamped 11:19	173:18 180:22	string 78:19	108:15,24	208:16 210:5
219:18 265:4,9	statements	254:13 274:16	129:23,25	215:4,7,10,22
stand 127:12	235:23	278:23	255:24 278:9	216:3,21
standard 186:14	states 1:1 6:11	structure	suggestion	219:19 224:4,8
186:20	6:16 15:14	163:18 209:24	34:14 119:20	225:17 244:25
standing 83:10	21:21 176:16	stuff 33:25	227:3 229:18	253:15 273:23
standpoint	185:10,22	subfiles 21:6	256:21,25	275:2
114:9 239:8	186:2,6,23	subject 8:10	267:24 278:11	surmise 181:20
stand-alone	280:13	17:25 38:2	suggests 108:16	182:21
58:16	statewide	42:24 47:23	suing 158:6	surprise 82:14
stapled 70:10	198:20	57:25 60:8	Suite 3:8,12,20	106:2,7 112:18
start 52:14	stating 120:25	143:1 147:2	3:24 280:23	112:20 156:5
81:18 90:8	206:17	186:21 191:22	281:2,10,14	156:11 157:12
97:8 101:2	statistical 224:6	submission	sum 145:13	165:8 196:21
166:9 173:19	224:8	247:1	205:3 208:3	241:21
174:11 175:24	statistics 152:8	submissions	summary 22:19	surprised 29:2
195:10 211:10	153:8	265:10	summer 50:10	29:24 41:3
273:23 274:3,3	statute 65:14	submit 30:17	super 234:6	63:2,5,7 64:19
279:15	192:6	247:12	235:17 236:10	66:6 72:11
started 97:4,6,7	stayed 32:20	submitted 11:17	237:7 243:8	118:24 119:7
113:9 199:6	step 191:23	273:12	supervision	119:10 231:19
244:6 278:18	stepped 160:2	subordinate	151:13,15	surprising 119:1
starting 136:13	steps 151:19	88:14	153:5	125:9
274:16	239:5	subpoena 93:15	support 80:9	surrounding
starts 50:16	Steve 6:2	279:9	136:12	84:17 146:25
state 2:24 6:19	stipulate 111:24	subpoenaing	supportive	147:6 195:8
30:12 38:23,25	stipulated	247:9	135:20 258:25	survive 141:17
39:12 40:4,5,7 40:8 42:19	153:10,15	Subsequent 143:12	suppose 7:19	suspect 72:16 195:7
	stop 272:16 store 156:7		31:15 123:9	swear 7:9
43:11,13 44:21 45:19 46:2	story 166:19	subsequently 207:21	supposed 25:16 94:1 167:10	swear 7.9 switch 70:9
50:23 55:18	straight 153:14	substance 33:10	189:10,14	sworn 7:12
60:19,24 61:1	155:15	substance 33.10 substantial	Supreme 67:19	233:24 236:19
63:20 88:23	strategic 16:15	91:11 140:10	267:4,9	236:23 237:2
104:2 111:23	95:13	162:13 195:11	sure 9:19 10:8	281:17
114:11 122:7	strategies 178:8	195:12	19:8 25:9,19	s.c 2:25 3:4,11
123:12,13	street 2:25 3:5,8	Substantially	37:6,7 41:7	3:19 280:7,19
136:11 154:1	3:12,16,20	237:23	42:3 45:5,17	281:1,9
156:14,15	53:14 115:3,7	substantive	48:9 52:4,4	
164:9 180:6	115:15,17,24	65:5 94:14,19	53:3,4 54:13	T
186:23,25	155:8,19 156:2	94:23	69:11 73:14	T 4:8
188:15 191:1	280:7,20,23	subsumed 88:18	74:10 76:24,25	table 126:10
192:6 194:18	281:2,6,10	succeeding	77:15,17,25	129:15 141:24
195.11 207.22	stricken 268·15	278.14	78.2 79.14	278.15

2/22/12

195:11 207:22

78:2 79:14

278:15

278:14

stricken 268:15

				1 uge 312
Tad 17:18 61:21	112:14,24	143:4,6 144:5	terrific 163:6	73:4 78:14
75:14 78:5	133:8,21 135:7	144:11,17	testified 7:12	108:3 120:18
81:23 117:3	135:10 152:4	146:13 155:25	30:2 34:24	126:5 157:15
134:6 139:1	157:7 158:11	157:7 160:5	39:24 110:9	157:16 166:4
160:1 174:8	165:9 168:11	163:19,22,23	112:11 113:17	184:7 187:20
175:22 180:23	168:12 169:12	164:3 165:4,20	113:22 161:21	187:20,21
181:18 193:19	177:2 183:2	167:21 191:4	173:3 214:9	232:13 243:14
198:4,18 253:9	211:13 253:8	211:1 248:18	236:5 256:3	248:5 268:19
254:21 258:6	253:25 254:2	253:10 257:3	278:10	279:7,8
278:5	255:5 257:10	257:21 270:19	testify 77:3,6	thanks 201:8
Tad's 206:19	talking 8:14	272:5 277:11	79:21 80:5,10	253:21
Taffora 13:16	19:18 63:25	team's 95:13	80:11,16	theirs 276:4
	65:4 72:22		*	
17:21 48:25		tear 268:9	125:10 126:8	Theo 180:16
77:9 78:6	74:21 86:8	technically	126:17 128:9	theories 33:20
88:18 90:2	91:8 96:15	47:10 214:1	128:14,24	thing 11:16 66:8
117:4 130:25	134:16 135:3	tell 26:16 36:22	129:2,11	68:8 72:22
168:3 209:12	147:5 148:23	84:12 85:14	133:20 134:8	74:4 119:13
209:17 210:2	167:10 169:17	133:9 134:18	135:13,16	148:23 156:13
211:1 221:7	172:23 174:1,2	143:13 150:13	144:16 247:19	192:10 202:11
276:12	175:10,15	183:15 201:2	260:10,15	202:19 215:9
take 18:12 37:19	187:9 188:17	206:3 214:5	261:16 275:16	things 22:15
38:14 48:7	193:7 197:23	234:4 244:15	281:17	71:19 84:18
52:3 74:7	206:23 209:21	250:19 251:25	testifying 61:17	96:19 112:12
107:5 108:25	217:23 222:7	254:5 258:15	118:17 125:11	122:16 127:19
114:7 124:17	230:17 243:25	258:19,22	204:20 236:18	136:15 147:15
126:9 128:4	270:14	259:7 261:8	testimony 15:13	148:19 153:24
129:13,21	TAMMY 1:10	278:1,3	16:10 21:16	154:18,18
140:4,23	tan 150:18,18	telling 140:16	22:2 28:24	157:22 159:23
141:23 158:20	tannish 150:17	tells 84:3	29:1 42:23	181:21 188:17
162:25 170:8	tape 178:16	ten 8:1 45:10	51:14,17,19	198:16 199:1
170:13 184:11	task 178:2	76:3 114:2	62:6,17,19	210:20 211:22
184:21,25	tasks 167:25	149:7 271:10	63:10 64:7,17	214:20,22
187:16 191:23	177:21 191:12	tend 18:7	66:6 79:3,13	254:11 277:7
199:9 207:23	taught 76:22	171:20	80:8,13 95:3	think 8:20 9:17
217:22 242:25	113:22	ten-year 7:25	99:7 103:4,19	11:11 12:7
267:13	teach 76:19	term 55:15	105:8,13,19	16:17 20:10
taken 2:20	teaches 76:20	60:11,13,14	111:5,7 113:4	26:9,9 33:13
48:12 87:9	team 9:8 10:6	62:11 65:10,11	115:19 118:16	33:13 42:21,22
107:10 142:15	10:17 27:25,25	91:7 135:25	126:13 127:14	45:21 46:2,14
149:20 152:3	48:18 49:2,7	146:24 147:8	127:15 130:19	47:17 48:23
184:16 212:10	50:4 51:13,16	152:14,15	134:17 135:4	49:5 53:10,23
218:12 222:22	52:25 59:16	165:5 237:7,24	139:18 143:1	53:25 55:7,12
231:11 248:8	71:2,12 73:11	terminal 227:14	145:21 157:5	55:16 59:5
276:2 280:6,10	73:12 75:3,6,7	227:16,19	159:22 215:19	68:12,14 75:5
280:12 282:1	75:9 87:24	229:19,21	217:23 225:14	75:13 79:15,16
talk 18:8 67:18	89:7,9,10,12	terminals 227:6	226:11 230:20	81:3 86:21
80:22 100:3	96:4 97:4,22	230:23 231:12	230:21 232:2	89:3,11,19
106:18 123:1	99:17,18,24	terminated 43:4	233:24 236:4	91:4,6,10,24
126:15 133:6	100:7,8 102:21	termination	236:19,23	93:1,13,18,23
134:11 135:6	104:12,23	43:3	237:2 246:18	94:6 99:4
135:11 146:19	105:9 106:11	terms 11:6 33:2	247:2,12	101:21,24
157:5 203:1	107:1 109:24	51:15 88:9	256:24	103:8,12
208:7 249:4,12	110:11 111:2	130:22 147:2	text 179:14	107:24 110:20
250:23 254:16	112:2,7,14,22	152:6 197:7	240:12,15,17	112:11 113:8
267:6	113:6 121:7,10	217:4 262:23	240:19	115:13 119:23
talked 9:2,3	136:19 137:13	263:21	thank 25:22	122:8 123:19
36:8 76:25,25	137:19 138:22	terrible 77:24	28:14 38:13	125:19,19
86:23 93:23	142:17,23	terribly 147:4	67:24 70:12	126:4,25

129:22 130:14	181:2 190:14	164:23 165:7,9	178:11 183:4,5	tried 104:18
134:11,13	190:14,18	166:20 167:2,9	185:17 190:22	119:12 212:24
137:6 148:17	216:6 217:9	167:15,23	202:11 257:25	tries 15:23
151:17,17,23	218:25 237:1	168:15 169:3	258:14	trip 189:15
153:25 155:1	242:11 254:22	169:18,22	tomorrow 61:13	Troupis 1:19
157:4 158:11	255:15 261:25	171:17 172:3,8	94:5 99:9	2:19 3:23 4:3
159:16 160:9,9	265:25 271:13	173:8 174:14	175:15 279:9	4:10 6:6 7:7,10
162:24 163:3	274:24	176:19 177:16	top 142:4,6	7:15 18:2
165:6 166:1,1	thousand	177:25 178:20	278:4	19:18 28:21
166:2 167:2,5	249:11	179:2,22 182:4	topic 193:9	30:1 47:24
167:23 169:21	three 46:18	186:8 188:19	209:7	61:6 78:7 85:5
170:3,25	58:15 134:12	189:1,17,19,22	topical 191:10	87:12,15 90:20
172:11 173:6,7	151:21,23,23	190:6,21 196:8	topics 195:4	107:14 158:3
176:25 177:11	176:5 178:25	197:25,25	total 31:8,20,21	158:20 163:3
180:17 181:22	180:18 186:5	198:2,22	32:6 173:1	163:17 170:18
182:8 187:12	197:3,16,19	199:21 200:15	205:3 208:3	175:6 178:20
189:6 190:16	235:9 244:10	201:20 203:23	246:3 255:8,9	179:1,4 183:9
190:21 192:10	267:16,18	204:3,9,11	touch 111:12,13	184:17,22
193:23 196:2	272:18	207:18 208:12	114:10 141:25	188:2,8 191:19
197:18,20	Thursday 93:22	211:5,8,14	142:1 146:16	193:15 199:10
199:8,17,23	THYSSEN 1:6	216:7 218:4	town 107:22	200:11,19
201:1 202:9	tie 87:15	227:1 232:24	148:12,13	201:4 203:6 205:24 206:6
203:22,22 204:2 205:2,10	till 129:7 time 6:6 8:13,14	238:2 244:23 250:22 255:13	track 87:5 tract 251:15	211:3 212:15
206:5,9,17	8:15,23 12:18	259:6 261:15	tracts 212:2	221:2 232:15
208:19 214:8	13:1 20:20	262:11 264:1	trade 65:16,18	237:15 247:2,4
215:18 217:22	25:20 29:13,17	272:19,24	traditionally	247:21 264:11
229:25 230:14	30:5,8 32:10	275:21 278:12	224:3 262:1,14	265:2,16 266:6
231:19 233:19	32:12,17 34:14	279:18 282:1	trail 33:16	266:18 267:15
236:4 246:14	35:25 43:3	times 187:12	transcript 5:2,3	267:22 272:18
255:3,13	44:14 45:5,5	198:1	97:17 232:16	272:23 274:13
257:10,25	49:12 51:6,25	time-sensitive	247:2	274:17 276:24
262:6 264:14	53:4,11 54:20	102:21	transitioning	279:7,17 280:6
275:14 276:3	56:23 64:14	timing 196:5	149:12	281:13
278:18	65:1 74:10,18	TIMOTHY 1:15	transitions	true 8:2 34:17
thinking 80:22	74:21 75:4,9	2:14	147:22 148:20	42:6,11,13
109:15 126:16	75:10 79:3,19	title 27:14 68:20	transpired 33:23	102:23 131:16
174:11 178:10	83:5 86:17	69:18,20	75:20	131:19 137:9
third 13:22	87:1,13 89:8	titled 64:23	travel 200:6,7	144:6 157:3,9
77:21 95:6,16	95:24 96:11,13	today 11:14	TRAVIS 1:6	162:17 173:9
96:3,7,9 98:22	96:14,15,17,22	15:13 16:10	tremendous	231:20 276:18
99:1 164:9	96:25 98:2,17	21:16,21 42:20	149:5	281:19
176:15 216:12	98:19,21 99:14	67:11 93:9	trending 216:8	truly 224:1
240:13	99:21,22	121:18 122:9	234:11,25	trumping 93:3
Thirteen 133:15	102:10,20	122:12 129:21	trends 216:16	trust 30:9,25
133:16	103:5,20 104:4	135:17 141:7	trial 9:22,23	173:1,13
THOMAS 1:14	106:9,14,25	195:18 248:8	13:14 25:19	truth 97:13,16
1:15 2:4,13,14	107:2 113:11	258:7 262:13	50:18 61:13	97:16 102:19
thought 20:20	115:14 117:20	told 22:25 36:20	65:1 93:16	122:22 128:2
29:25 32:23	121:6,17 122:9	43:4 51:23	94:1 99:7	233:16 234:18
77:22 88:3	122:18 127:2	52:6 67:2	121:21 124:19	281:17,18,18
89:17 101:25 118:13,22,23	128:16 130:3 130:21 137:5,5	84:15 95:5,8 96:11 108:25	124:20 131:24 132:3 162:18	truthful 135:24 try 18:13,16
130:2,25	142:18 144:14	112:24,25	162:23 167:23	44:15 45:15
137:20,22	144:25 145:14	114:24 117:22	175:15 178:4	52:9 64:18
151:13 159:16	147:24 149:1	120:4 124:11	191:17 247:9	76:10 105:5
159:24 166:17	152:12,24	128:18 137:24	261:4 279:8	121:22 122:17
180:13,23	160:7,15,20	167:24 172:19	trials 36:21	154:16 207:22
			00.21	1510 201.22

247:4 252:13	138:14	213:17,20	154:17 223:25	209:22
259:13 276:13	type 84:18	240:25 261:16	238:5	Voces 2:8 3:9
276:16	140:24 167:4	272:5	various 17:19	6:12,21 139:7
trying 19:4 41:6	180:17,20	understood	26:13 43:22	139:22 140:9
41:7,21,25	203:8 227:14	60:18,25 103:8	44:10 71:19	144:6,11
		,		
45:11,12 53:24	251:7 269:8	103:10,14	99:25 147:18	240:20 241:14
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		104:12,24		242:8 257:24
53:24 54:2,2,6	types 51:21		152:21 153:24	
54:10 66:23	147:18 195:14	105:9 118:4,16	174:9 196:16	280:24
74:8 76:11	269:9	139:21 163:25	198:16 217:21	VOCKE 1:15
81:6,8 84:20	typing 125:9	171:22 216:22	249:14 250:6	2:14
	126:4 192:9		venue 209:5	
88:4,5 89:5	120.4 192.9	underwater		Vos 22:10,23
92:14 94:11		169:22	VERA 1:6	23:2 24:13
	U			27:13 199:18
99:6 121:23		underway 86:13	verbal 87:24	
122:16 123:18	ultimately 13:17	undisclosed	280:11	voted 238:5
124:13 128:1,2	74:16 111:13	247:18 248:17	version 70:10	voter 91:12,13
128:4 147:13	153:3 156:21	undo 215:7	275:15	voters 90:14,23
				*
155:1 169:14	160:4 223:24	undoubtedly	versus 6:8,14	271:2
169:24,25	257:18	143:24 172:9	65:2 68:13	voting 8:10,22
172:16 183:19	umbrage 55:16	Unfortunately	155:3	9:9 10:15,22
204:22 205:9	unavailable	201:21	vicinity 10:16	11:1,9 68:14
				*
219:18 223:11	126:18 127:16	unhappy 208:21	10:23 87:1	91:15,22
238:9 243:11	unaware 120:4	United 1:1 6:11	271:2	195:13 215:1
244:3,25	121:15	6:16 15:14	video 1:18 2:19	217:4,13 224:4
247:17 254:9	uncommon	21:21 280:13	6:5 87:11	239:4,11 241:4
255:3 260:2	168:1 178:9	unlimited 34:6	178:19,25	241:10 242:17
274:20 277:6	unconcerned	unnecessary	272:18,22	243:23 244:5
Tuesday 83:16	104:8	98:12	279:16	252:20 255:20
124:25 132:5	unconfuse 64:18	unneeded 244:2	Videographer	256:4 271:1,12
turn 232:19	undercharge	unrelated 83:20	6:2 7:8 48:10	271:20 272:6
turned 86:20	177:19,19	unusual 263:1	48:13 87:7,10	272:10
	•		•	272.10
89:16 189:17	undergo 147:22	263:10,14	87:10 107:8,11	
turnout 269:14	underpopulati	upset 118:5	116:18,21	l W
		. –		-
270:7,20	68:14	urban 244:6	149:18,21	W 1:4
turns 272:13	underreprese	use 12:20 21:8	178:13,18,24	wait 19:1 29:13
Twenty-one	245:3	21:10 28:14	212:8,11	29:14,14
170:11	understand	34:22 35:25	220:13,15,18	108:19 225:1
twice 190:14	21:12 28:1	60:10,13,14	268:21 272:17	waiting 20:7
two 18:18 27:10	30:1 44:19	65:10,11 68:21	272:21 279:16	172:10 211:16
27:17,17 44:5	46:6 54:12	72:21,21 165:5	videotape 184:9	waiver 268:18
50:1 76:23	56:12 61:6	194:10 204:3	view 46:5 98:8	walk 170:2
83:19 87:11	63:25 65:3	227:19 228:21	102:23 121:12	walked 86:23
88:6,22 91:15	66:5 97:18	236:5 237:24	126:17 131:6	Walker 25:14,15
91:19,20	98:8 104:17	247:17	141:7,9,10	124:1
104:15 105:1	105:3 106:13	usually 154:5	178:11 217:7	want 10:2 21:17
		•		
114:8,8 119:21	108:20 118:21	utilized 152:11	217:16 218:14	27:24 33:15,16
121:4 122:23	120:20 122:11		219:4 243:4	37:19 47:11
		T7		
142:23 144:3	122:13 147:9	V	250:3 263:23	52:7,10 57:12
154:3 170:25	162:7 175:13	v 1:12 2:11	viewed 141:7	59:15 64:1
171:3 178:13	243:11,13,22	vacation 94:2	views 49:9,13,15	68:24 69:19
178:19 202:18	understanding	132:6	49:23 219:7	74:6 80:22
203:15 206:2,7	14:2 27:24	vague 176:16	224:7,7	83:22 96:23
208:14 213:13	39:23 40:21	177:6	Village 189:24	99:13 100:1,5
214:8 216:4,10	60:23 95:2	Van 3:11 37:15	virtually 60:20	100:23 102:12
219:1 235:15	102:12 106:13	37:24 88:22	visited 165:8	103:13 104:2
236:8 244:10	111:15 171:14	281:1	visiting 188:18	108:19 120:14
254:15 268:21	172:4 178:9	vap 255:8,9	visually 150:23	122:17,22
			_	
269:2 276:9,10	185:13,15	VARA 2:8,8	151:1	126:8 127:11
two-sided	-	variety 154.2 3	vis-a-vis 39:19	128.24 129.17
	211.0,10	101.2,0	1 20 0 720 00.10	140.41147.11
two-sided	211:3,15	variety 154:2,3	vis-a-vis 39:19	128:24 129:1

		-		
133:6,9 142:7	109:16 111:6	94:11 97:13	wise 34:22	241:19 242:1
143:7 145:25	120:13 121:13	98:16 99:6	wish 105:15,15	247:6,7,7,9,17
152:2 154:16	128:19 129:23	175:10,14	122:24 180:25	247:20,23
154:22 177:20	130:2 134:12	187:9 192:10	wished 257:15	248:7,9,15
178:2 181:6	135:9 136:5	199:23 201:20	wishes 117:20	249:9 250:16
182:19 184:12	141:10 156:11	224:3 248:10	WisPolitics	258:24 259:13
194:19 200:23	156:16,18,20	253:21 264:14	85:25 86:5	260:17 261:25
204:8 206:4	171:18 173:12	265:8	145:17 240:13	264:10 266:19
215:6,9 220:13	183:5 184:6	we've 14:18,25	withdraw 242:2	267:10 268:19
232:10 233:21	185:15 194:17	32:20 37:11	259:22,25	270:4,17,23
237:16 240:17	194:23 226:7	50:1 68:7	267:25 268:7	270.4,17,23
246:14 264:3,8	226:11 230:5	77:23 123:24	272:15	277:4 278:20
267:11 273:6	234:11,25	124:11 153:15	withdrawn	277.4 278.20 279:4,8
275:19	239:13 244:4	155:9 179:5	268:15 279:9	witnesses
wanted 9:6	246:22,24	191:16 208:5,5	279:11,13	183:23
	247:5 251:19	221:20 222:14	,	
69:11 79:13			withhold 15:6	WMC 180:12,14
97:12 128:9,14 129:2 132:6	254:10 262:2 262:18	230:17 232:6 267:5 277:19	15:10 witness 4:2 7:5	Wonderfully 147:20
141:23 145:3	ways 122:6	whatsoever	7:6,9,10 8:17	
159:5 163:7	ways 122:0 154:3 224:2	156:23	9:14,19,24	wondering 76:7 175:14
171:1 177:12	wedged 167:25	Wheeler 145:16	12:6 14:7,15	word 20:18 21:3
	wedged 107.23		19:21 25:16,19	
215:3,4,22 216:11 240:4	163:13 188:18	whichever 133:8 187:20	38:3 43:1 47:1	21:8,10,12 72:21,21 79:10
242:8	190:7 205:14		47:25 48:9	80:8 108:21
wanting 129:10		whipping 54:25	53:23 55:9,14	117:17 126:3
142:10	weeks 75:14 Welcome 7:15	55:2,4,20 white 92:14	58:2,10 60:10	128:17 120:3
wants 134:15	71:8	122:24 148:3	65:22,24,25	169:24
136:7 142:7	Wells 3:20	197:1 271:2	68:21 69:1	wording 176:7,8
242:7 264:6	281:10	whites 270:21	70:5 73:5	176:11
ward 209:2,23	well-known	Whyte 3:19 7:5	79:15,16,18	words 44:20
210:3,6,11,16	106:21 123:5,7	94:25 281:9	80:15 81:19	65:6 92:7 96:4
210:3,0,11,10	123:19	wide 101:2	92:4,13 99:8	104:3 109:12
211:23	went 29:23	wife 126:1	101:3 103:1,24	109:14 127:22
wards 211:18	32:21 34:11	willing 80:10	101.3 103.1,24	127:23,24,25
Washington	51:7 54:5	133:19 168:13	109:6,13	128:24,25
182:8,9	56:16 85:23	260:10,14	111:10 116:13	130:5 134:25
wasn't 16:13,24	98:25 119:8	winding 216:25	116:23 127:8	145:25
20:15 35:7	151:19 155:3	Wisconsin 1:1	132:10,22	work 10:5 12:20
51:21 52:2	163:5 218:24	1:13,20 2:1,12	143:3 146:14	15:11 34:17
54:1,10 77:23	226:8,11	2:15,24,25 3:5	147:4 157:15	35:6,6 64:15
88:1,2 133:5	241:13	3:8,12,15,17	157:17 166:6	64:16 73:22
140:13 160:11	weren't 63:5,7	3:20,24 6:4,9	175:17 181:9	74:5 87:16
202:13,13	west 3:16 155:3	6:12,14,18	181:11 184:3,7	99:12 141:9
205:4,4 211:21	189:12 281:6	21:22 38:23,25	184:11 188:6	158:8 159:14
215:14 228:10	Western 50:21	39:12 40:6,8	202:7,23 203:1	162:12 165:13
wasting 242:20	245:20	43:11,12 44:21	203:12 204:16	172:5 177:13
watched 193:5	we'll 12:14	46:2 84:5,6,8	213:9 214:15	178:7 189:2
water 2:25 3:4	36:13 62:22	123:12,13	220:3,6,11,14	226:2 230:5
3:12 20:6	68:16,19 78:12	156:14,15	221:19 225:15	265:22 276:3
	*	186:23,25	226:1,5,19	worked 27:25,25
	80:6 102:4		· / - /	
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25	80:6 102:4 111:24 170:2	189:24 192:5,6	227:24 228:7	49:19,21 68:2
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25	111:24 170:2	189:24 192:5,6		
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22	228:20 229:7	168:19 173:13
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5 29:23 32:19	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8 248:11 279:6	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25	228:20 229:7 229:14,25	168:19 173:13 working 33:11
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25 245:12 262:12	228:20 229:7	168:19 173:13
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5 29:23 32:19 34:11,13,23	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8 248:11 279:6 we're 18:13 20:2	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25 245:12 262:12 280:1,5,7,14	228:20 229:7 229:14,25 230:12 232:11 232:13 233:23	168:19 173:13 working 33:11 61:22 66:13 110:21 138:1
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5 29:23 32:19 34:11,13,23 36:2 51:2 53:6	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8 248:11 279:6 we're 18:13 20:2 28:21 36:18	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25 245:12 262:12 280:1,5,7,14 280:16,20,23	228:20 229:7 229:14,25 230:12 232:11 232:13 233:23 234:9,23	168:19 173:13 working 33:11 61:22 66:13
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5 29:23 32:19 34:11,13,23 36:2 51:2 53:6 63:8 72:18	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8 248:11 279:6 we're 18:13 20:2 28:21 36:18 61:13 62:22	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25 245:12 262:12 280:1,5,7,14 280:16,20,23 281:2,5,7,10	228:20 229:7 229:14,25 230:12 232:11 232:13 233:23	168:19 173:13 working 33:11 61:22 66:13 110:21 138:1 167:16,18,21
280:7,19 281:2 way 9:4 19:25 21:2 24:5 29:23 32:19 34:11,13,23 36:2 51:2 53:6 63:8 72:18 73:7 75:20	111:24 170:2 201:23 220:8 248:11 279:6 we're 18:13 20:2 28:21 36:18 61:13 62:22 65:6 72:22	189:24 192:5,6 194:18,22 209:18 231:25 245:12 262:12 280:1,5,7,14 280:16,20,23	228:20 229:7 229:14,25 230:12 232:11 232:13 233:23 234:9,23 236:13,20	168:19 173:13 working 33:11 61:22 66:13 110:21 138:1 167:16,18,21 167:22 168:2

173:16 281:6 134:20 190:16 132:20 190:16 181:2 1245:524 143:4 255:6 184:25.24 143:4 255:6 184:20.59 10-45 279:18, 19		I	1	T.	
1901:0 191:5 230:15 250:5 230:15 250:5 255:6 255:6 255:6 279:12 210:5 254:9 210:5 254:9 210:5 254:9 210:5 254:9 210:5 254:9 210:5 257:18,19 210:5 258:19 220:12 243:20 24	176:6,12 190:6	130:16 132:20	10:45 81:20	17 3:16 281:6	114:2 148:20
230:15 250:5 142:524 143:4 10:34 7272:24 248:18 70:19:7 37:17 70:19:19:19:20:19:20:20:19:20:20:20:19:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:20:		133:17 141:3	86:19	17th 185:7	159:6,14
255:6 workplace 65:13 works 41:2 world 115:7			10:47 272:24		
workplace 65:13 works 41:2 world 115:7 279:12 year 43:6 52:22 year 516:23 year 516:3 year 516:4 year 516:4 year 516:2 year 516:4 year 516:5 year 516:4 year 516:5 year 516:1 year 516:5 year 516:1 year 516:5 year					
works 41:2 279:12 100 225:17 176 149:25 70:18,22 71:49 worry 165:25 166:3 249:21 100 3:12 281:2 178 4:19 78:20,25 80:19 worth 178:5 yers 8:1 43:18 249:21 1254:17 258:5 184 4:20,20 83:16 85:6,8 wouldn't 9:3 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 175:22 276:10 184 4:20,20 83:16 85:6,8 11:3 16:17 40:20 74:1 76:3 84:21 11-CV-1011 184 4:21 102:22 124:16 50:2 53:11 49:7,7 165:17 63:13 72:10 228:22,25.25 6:10 11-CV-1011 232:15 14:11 158:13 14:11 158:13 159:24 163:9 77:22 82:14 yesterday 11:66 253:21 11:15 81:20 28:10 1990 3:20 159:24 163:9 159:24 163:9 15:712 165:8 168:1 174:1 yesterday 11:66 253:11 11:06 253:11 1990 4:40:92 11:15 18:12 1995 226:5 Z Z Z Z 244:12 18:13 13:9:18 15:712 162:8 2 Z Z Z 244:12 1990 3:32:0					
worlied 142:9 year 43:6 52:22 244:20 178 4:19 71:3 77:4,19 75:25 80:19 71:3 77:4,19 75:25 80:19	_		•		
varied 142-9 243:20 106:15 108-2 102 324 281:14 1175:23 1837:17 190:6 81:18 82:10 1175:23 125:17 252:615 352:64 77:22 252:10 118 161:7 17:25 26:15 38:17 100:16 118:16 17:25 26:15 352:64 17:25 28:124 149:77, 165:17 63:13 72:10 228:22,52.5 61:0 228:22,52.5 61:0 11:15 81:10 12:18 18:24 140:16,17,18 128:15 129:7 188:16 250:22 25:10 25:32,24 157:12 165:3 22:0 25:10 220:24 221:3 168:11 17:12 222:20 226:5 220:24 221:3 183:22 220:24 221:3 183:22 220:24 221:3 183:24 220:24 221:15 128:15 129:7 118:12 133:5,7 220:24 221:3 183:24 183:24 183:25 183:24 183:25 183					
243:20					
169:23 227:18 1175:23 249:21 254:17 258:51 274:4,17 258:61 275:22 276:10 111:3 161:1 232:15 141:11 158:24 138:4 139:15 276:22 276:10 111:3 161:2 124:25 131:10 111:3 161:2 124:25 131:10 111:3 161:2 124:25 131:10 133:21:6 136:81 143:18 143:1					
166:3 worth 178:5 worth 178:5 worth 178:5 wouldn't 9:3 11:3 16:17 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 44:9 45:10 11th 276:11 11th 276:11 1232:15 138:24 139:15 139:42 139:42 139:42					
woth 178:5 years 8: 1.43:18 4274:4.17 188.4:21 161:2 120:22 124:16 122:24:16 120:22 124:16 124:25 131:10 124:15:13 125:14 128:13 159:14 128:13 159:14 128:13 159:14 128:13 159:14 128:13 159:14 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 128:15 129:7 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19 129:04 18:19				,	
11:3 16:17					
17:25 26:15 35:26 47:12 89:17 101:6 149:7,7 165:17 228:22,25,25 226:63 27:10 228:22,25,25 110:0 17:28:13 172:10 228:22,25,25 226:63 27:10 150:14 1158:13 20:10 166:11 169:11 166:11 169:11 166:11 169:11 166:11 169:11 166:11 169:11 168:11 174:1 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 150:14 179:12 188:16 250:22 188:16 250:22 188:16 250:22 265:10 220:24 221:3 244:12 188:10 189:2 1990:3 2:0 169:13 160:18 1990:3 2:0 169:13 160:19 166:11 169:10 166:11 169:10 166:11 169:10 166:11 169:10 166:11 169:10 166:11 169:10 160:18 20:22 170:22 77:19 224:12,21 201:1,15 220:24 221:3 246:17 221:15 227:18 225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 25:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17 2225:22 246:17					
35:2,6 47:12					
50:2 53:11					
63:13 72:10 77:22 82:14 88:18 93:6 112:18 118:24 140:16,17,18 144:3 145:20 156:23,24 157:12 165:8 168:1 174:1 199:5 226:5 227:16 228:20 246:13 wrestle 99:2 write 14:8 33:24 41:17 125:21 125:23 254:10 writing 13:25 14:3 41:17 206:11 254:21 writings 11:8 written 31:2,5 125:18 158:25 wrong 9:15 231:11 wrote 14:6,7,25 15:1 81:16 96:12 242:6 x x yeah 11:16 14:25 33:13 37:7,11,21 38:7 40:14,17 40:17 76:5,17 83:25 86:1,24 10 228:20 10 228:20 10 228:20 10 228:20 10 228:20 10 228:20 118:19 23:21 118 110:6 10 228:22 25:25 111 58:10 11:15 81:20 11:15 81:20 11:30 221:9 11:60 221:9 1166 253:11 1990 148:19 1990 14:10 224:12 21190 13:16 193 12222 24:12 21190 13:16 166:23 14:16 171:90 27:16 27:10 24:11 1990 32:20 190					
R8:18 93:6 Sile 18:24 11:18 18:24 12:18 18:25 15:14 13:35 15:14 13:30 221:9 15:18 18:24 14:3 145:20 15:18 18:25 166:19 166:253:11 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 15:12 166:253:11 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 1990 148:19 188:10 189:2 1990 148:19 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 188:10 189:10 1890 148:19 188:10 189:10 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1890 148:19 1					
88:18 93:6					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
112:18 118:24 150:14 1130 221:9 1980's 203:15 175:23 179:13 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:23 179:13 185:11 187:1 185:11 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 185:11 187:1 187:1 187:1 185:11 187:1 187:1 187:1 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12 187:12					
140:16,17,18					
144:3 145:20					
186:23,24 188:16 250:22 265:10 202:24 221:3 43:19,23 24:13 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:23 254:10 225:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 25:22 225:22 25:22 25:22 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 24:25 241:4 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 24:25 241:4 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 225:7 245:18 231:21 232:17 24:25 241:4 225:13 24:12 217:12 2					
157:12 165:8 168:1 174:1 young 88:8 220:24 221:3 43:19,23 224:12,21 201:1,15 201:1,15 227:16 228:20 246:13 246:13 246:13 246:13 246:13 232:22 241:17 125:21 125:23 254:10 220:24 24:4 277:12 22 220:24 27:3 241:17 125:21 125:23 254:10 106:18,20,24 118:7 257:19 218:36 117:5 231:21 232:17 206:11 254:21 118:7 257:19 218:36 117:5 231:11 xorte 14:6,7,25 15:1 81:16 96:12 242:6					
168:1 174:1 199:5 226:5 Z 225:7 245:18 221:15 227:18 222:16 228:20 Z 246:13 232:17 232:22 232:22 241:17 125:21 232:22 254:17 258:5 241:17 125:21 225:23 254:10 225:23 254:10 225:23 254:10 226:11 254:21 106:18 20,24 118:7 257:19 226:11 254:21 226:11 252:24 254:14 118:7 257:19 226:11 258:4 118:7 257:19 226:11 258:3 246:17 226:11 258:3 246:17 226:11 258:3 246:17 238:16 124:16 125:23 254:10 226:11 254:21 106:18 20,24 118:7 257:19 118:7 257:19 277:12 124:69:16 70:9 175:12 280:8 282:8 270:14 199:17 226:11 242:6 242:6	•				
199:5 226:5 Z R8:20 80:19 225:7 245:18 231:21 322:18 R8:13 82:20 246:17 231:21 232:17 246:13 R8:16 124:16 131:10 187:1 12th 70:24 71:2 2 2 254:17 258:5 260:8 274:4 231:21 232:17 252:32 254:10 232:22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2					
Zamarripa 81:13 82:20 246:17 231:21 232:17 wrestle 99:2 write 14:8 33:24 41:17 125:21 125:23 254:10 18:12 133:5,7 232:22 2 20 124:25 241:4 22 179:12 26:65 3:16,20 87:13 90:8 201 49:7 165:17 27:22 27:19 201 49:7 165:17 27:22 27:19 201 49:7 165:17 27:22 27:19 201 49:7 165:17 27:22 27:19 200 14:25:17 200 13:22 201 49:7 165:17 27:22 27:19 200 14:25:17 200 13:25 201 14:25 33:13 27:16:24 200 15:22 27:16:24 27:		young 88:8			
246:13					
wrestle 99:2 118:12 133:5,7 131:10 187:1 260:8 274:4 41:17 125:21 232:22 12th 70:24 71:2 2 2012 1:20 3:1 41:17 125:23 254:10 2ero 57:15 2ero 57:16 2ero 57:15 2ero 57:14 2ero 14:40	227:16 228:20	Z	81:13 82:20	246:17	231:21 232:17
write 14:8 33:24 41:17 125:21 125:23 254:10 232:22 zero 57:15 12th 70:24 71:2 124:25 241:4 2 179:12 27:10 2 179:12 27:10 66:53:16,20 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 87:13 90:8 95:10 178:20 87:13 90:8 95:10 178:20 87:13 90:8 95:10 178:20 87:13 90:8 95:10 178:20 95:10 178:20 179:2 272:19 272:19 272:24 279:18 20149:7 165:17 272:24 279:18 179:2 272:19 272:24 279:18 20149:7 165:17 270:14,14,17 2000 32:20 2014 282:8 282:8 282:8 282:8 282:8 282:8 205:4:23,23 206:13:25 2014 282:10 205:14 243:14 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 205:14 243:14 205:14 243:14 207:14,16 205:14 243:14 209:12 24:23 245:12 2001 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 209:12 24:23 245:12 207:16;24 207:16;24 207:16;24 207:16;24 207:16;24 207:16;24 207:16;24 2001 52:22 278:9 209:12 24:23 245:12 21 170:10;12 21 170:10;12	246:13	Zamarripa	83:16 124:16	1992 225:22	254:17 258:5
41:17 125:21 2ero 57:15 124:25 241:4 2 179:12 6:6 53:16,20 writing 13:25 101:17 106:10 106:18,20,24 12:36 117:5 2:24 254:18 95:10 178:20 writings 11:8 118:7 257:19 123 69:5 70:11 2:24 254:18 179:2 272:19 written 31:2,5 2ipperer 23:3,4 23:8,10 24:13 23:8,10 24:13 257:14 199:17 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 41:18 58:4 23:8,10 24:13 27:14 199:17 70:11,14,17 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 wrong 9:15 23::11 \$ 78:25 85:5,8 133:18 134:19 224:23 245:12 209 124:15,19 yeah 11:16 \$50,000 32:5 27:14 199:17 276:10 246:9,17 277:16,24 277:16,24 x4:1,8 11:20 90:8 144:15 151:22 53:11 54:14 2170:10,12 278:9 yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 95:10 132:16 144:15 151:22 53:17 54:14 2100 3:12 281:2 212 4:5 yeah 11:16 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 158:21 66:20 72:14,16 221:20 6:6 14:25 33:13 37:7,11,21 179:12 158 4:4,16,16 26:27,23 27:19 221:20 6:6 <th>wrestle 99:2</th> <th>118:12 133:5,7</th> <th>131:10 187:1</th> <th></th> <th>260:8 274:4</th>	wrestle 99:2	118:12 133:5,7	131:10 187:1		260:8 274:4
125:23 254:10 writing 13:25	write 14:8 33:24	232:22	12th 70:24 71:2	2	2012 1:20 3:1
writing 13:25 101:17 106:10 12/14/10 4:16 153:21 95:10 178:20 14:3 41:17 206:11 254:21 117:21,22,24 117:21,22,24 117:21,22,24 118:7 257:19 20 149:7 165:17 272:24 279:18 written 31:2,5 2ipperer 23:3,4 23:8,10 24:13 23:8,10 24:13 27:14 199:17 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 wrong 9:15 23:1:1 \$375 32:1 \$39:7 77:4 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$50,000 32:5 205:16 210:16 246:9,17 277:16,24 yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 95:10 132:16 144:15 151:22 133:23:19 2002 25:17 212 4:5 yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 144:10,10 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 211:2,13 47:19 138:7 40:14,17 15t 188:9 158:22 158:22 221:2,13 47:19 212:20 6:6 38:7 40:14,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 169:4,9 2010 50:10,20 221:19,23 38:7 40:14,17 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 38:28 86:1,24 91:	41:17 125:21	zero 57:15	124:25 241:4	2 179:12	6:6 53:16,20
writing 13:25 101:17 106:10 12/14/10 4:16 153:21 95:10 178:20 14:3 41:17 206:11 254:21 117:21,22,24 117:21,22,24 117:21,22,24 118:7 257:19 20 149:7 165:17 272:24 279:18 written 31:2,5 2ipperer 23:3,4 23:8,10 24:13 23:8,10 24:13 27:14 199:17 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 wrong 9:15 23:1:1 \$375 32:1 \$39:7 77:4 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$50,000 32:5 205:16 210:16 246:9,17 277:16,24 yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 95:10 132:16 144:15 151:22 133:23:19 2002 25:17 212 4:5 yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 144:10,10 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 211:2,13 47:19 138:7 40:14,17 15t 188:9 158:22 158:22 221:2,13 47:19 212:20 6:6 38:7 40:14,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 169:4,9 2010 50:10,20 221:19,23 38:7 40:14,17 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 38:28 86:1,24 91:	125:23 254:10	Zeus 101:7,8,17	277:12	2,800 153:18,19	87:13 90:8
14:3 41:17			12/14/10 4:16		
206:11 254:21 117:21,22,24 118:7 257:19 124 69:16 70:9 70:11,14,17 280:8 282:8 200 3:20 2014 282:10 205 4:23,23 205 214 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:10 200 3:20 2014 282:1					
writings 11:8 118:7 257:19 124 69:16 70:9 175:12 280:8 282:8 written 31:2,5 41:18 58:4 23:8,10 24:13 127 11:20 44:10 45:4 205 4:23,23 231:11 \$ 139:7 77:4 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$375 32:1 \$205:16 210:16 224:23 245:12 209 124:15,19 231:21 232:17 205:16 210:16 246:9,17 277:16,24 231:21 232:17 276:10 13th 118:18 55:25 57:1 171:4,5,8 24:1,8 11:20 90:8 144:15 151:22 64:8 72:14,16 210 3:12 281:2 yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 212 4:5 14:25 33:13 37:7,11,21 179:12 158:0:29 95:11 168:22 214:24 221:2,13 47:19 38:7 40:14,17 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8	206:11 254:21		123 69:5 70:11	20 149:7 165:17	
written 31:2,5 41:18 58:4 23:8,10 24:13 70:11,14,17 2000 32:20 2014 282:10 wrong 9:15 231:11 \$ 139:7 77:4 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$ 133:18 134:19 224:23 245:12 209 124:15,19 15:1 81:16 \$50,000 32:5 205:16 210:16 246:9,17 27:16,24 96:12 242:6 0 13th 118:18 55:25 57:1 2001 52:22 278:9 X 11:20 90:8 144:15 151:22 53:11 54:14 21 170:10,12 171:4,5,8 yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 95:10 132:16 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 179:12 158 0:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 22:12,13 47:19 38:7 40:14,17 15t 188:9 15s 4:4,16,16 1690:4,9 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
41:18 58:4 23:8,10 24:13 27:14 199:17 44:10 45:4 205 4:23,23 wrong 9:15 31:11 78:25 85:5,8 114:2 148:19 209 124:15,19 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 205:16 210:16 224:23 245:12 209 124:15,19 96:12 242:6 0 231:21 232:17 246:9,17 277:16,24 276:10 231:21 232:17 2001 52:22 278:9 276:10 53:11 54:14 21 170:10,12 133 232:19 133 232:19 2002 25:17 212 4:5 11:20 90:8 11:20 90:8 144:10,10 55:25 57:1 64:8 72:14,16 210 3:12 281:2 212 4:5 139 200:12,19 54:14 55:25 14:23 20:2 212 4:5 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 1580:22 95:11 168:22 214:14 221:24:5 37:7,11,21 179:12 158 0:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 1690:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8	_				
125:18 158:25 27:14 199:17 13 9:7 77:4 52:22 97:7 206 131:25 wrong 9:15 31:11 \$ 133:18 134:19 224:23 245:12 209 124:15,19 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 205:16 210:16 246:9,17 277:16,24 96:12 242:6 550,000 32:5 231:21 232:17 2001 52:22 278:9 276:10 13th 118:18 55:25 57:1 171:4,5,8 14:1,8 144:15 151:22 64:8 72:14,16 2100 3:12 281:2 11:20 90:8 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 221:20 6:6 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
wrong 9:15 3 78:25 85:5,8 114:2 148:19 209 124:15,19 wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$205:16 210:16 246:9,17 277:16,24 96:12 242:6 550,000 32:5 231:21 232:17 2001 52:22 278:9 X 001028 78:11 144:15 151:22 55:25 57:1 171:4,5,8 Y 11:20 90:8 144:15 151:22 64:8 72:14,16 2100 3:12 281:2 yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 144:10,10 54:14 55:25 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 22 1:20 6:6 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 10:282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 169:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8	40=404=00=		4 6 6 4		
33:11		27.11.133.11			
wrote 14:6,7,25 \$375 32:1 \$50,000 32:5 246:9,17 277:16,24 96:12 242:6 0 331:21 232:17 2001 52:22 278:9 276:10 53:11 54:14 21 170:10,12 21 170:10,12 33 23:19 55:25 57:1 171:4,5,8 2100 3:12 281:2 33 23:19 11:20 90:8 14:15 151:22 2002 25:17 212 4:5 32:18,21 132:18,21 1580:22 95:11 55:25 57:1 14:23 20:2 14:4:15,151:22 139 200:12,19 54:14 55:25 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 22 1:20 6:6 138:7 40:14,17 179:12 1580:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 185:11 10:282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 179:12 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 279:17 270:19,23 279:17		\$			
15:1 81:16 96:12 242:6 231:21 232:17 2001 52:22 278:9 X 0 13th 118:18 55:25 57:1 171:4,5,8 X 4:1,8 1 133 232:19 2002 25:17 2100 3:12 281:2 Yeah 11:16 11:20 90:8 95:10 132:16 14th 159:1,6 52:22 53:17,19 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 37:7,11,21 179:12 1580:22 95:11 57:1 64:8 21:12,13 47:19 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 21:12,13 47:19 16 90:4,9 10:00 81:19 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8		-			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$,	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		ψου,ουο 04.0			
X X X X X X X X X Y X Y	70.14 4 14.0	0			
X 4:1,8 1 133 232:19 2002 25:17 219 4:10 14:20 Yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 14 4:10,10 54:14 55:25 219 4:10 14:20 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 57:1 64:8 21:12,13 47:19 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 22 1:20 6:6 38:7 40:14,17 1st 188:9 185:11 226:17,23 178:20 179:1 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8	X				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		001020 / 0:11			
Y 1 11:20 90:8 14 4:10,10 54:14 55:25 14:23 20:2 yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 14th 159:1,6 57:1 64:8 21:12,13 47:19 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 22 1:20 6:6 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 1st 188:9 185:11 226:17,23 178:20 179:1 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 16 90:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8	43 T.1,0	1			
yeah 11:16 95:10 132:16 14th 159:1,6 57:1 64:8 21:12,13 47:19 14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 22 1:20 6:6 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 16 90:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
14:25 33:13 132:18,21 163:9 192:13 66:20 72:14,16 22 1:20 6:6 37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 1st 188:9 185:11 226:17,23 178:20 179:1 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 164h 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
37:7,11,21 179:12 15 80:22 95:11 168:22 214:24 87:12 171:4 38:7 40:14,17 1st 188:9 185:11 226:17,23 178:20 179:1 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 16th 155:8,19 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
38:7 40:14,17 1st 188:9 185:11 226:17,23 178:20 179:1 40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 16 90:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
40:17 76:5,17 10 282:10 158 4:4,16,16 2010 50:10,20 272:19,23 83:25 86:1,24 10:00 81:19 16 90:4,9 53:3 54:3 279:17 91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
83:25 86:1,24					
91:18 110:6 10:30 264:5 16th 155:8,19 73:18,18 86:5 22nd 3:1 280:8					
110:7 127:24 10:43 272:19 150:2 107:20 108:1 22,000 153:19					
	116:7 127:24	10:43 272:19	150:2	107:20 108:1	22,000 153:19
			l		l

220 4:11 38:9		54 256:5	150:17 196:1	218:15,23
	3			
38:12 47:15,18	3 104:7 121:20	55 142:13 144:1	196:13,19,24	219:2,4 223:4
47:21 48:4	188:20	55.3 153:5	212:20 213:5,6	243:1,6,18
183:9 184:17	3rd 189:9	555 3:19 281:9	213:9,17,23,25	248:21,24
185:6	193:22	58 214:25	214:3,6 217:3	250:13 255:9
221 4:12 77:14		58th 271:9	217:4 218:14	256:5 257:5
78:12,15	3:30 131:10	000== = 1 = 1 = 1	218:23,23	9th 15:2 25:1,5
222 4:13 81:10	3:32 124:16	6	219:1,4 223:4	95:15 96:1
	125:1			
81:13 86:6	3:34 3:1 6:6	6 37:2 138:24	233:2 237:20	98:24 102:16
223 4:14 83:12	280:8	188:20	238:1,7 243:1	104:13,25
86:6	30 74:1 188:20	6th 32:10	243:6,18	105:10 150:7
224 4:15 85:2	228:25,25	6:13 107:9	248:21,24	150:10,12,18
225 4:16 158:17	300 3:8 280:23	6:29 107:12	250:13 251:1	150:24 151:4
158:21 159:8		6:41 116:19,22	255:8,20 257:5	152:4,17 155:7
226 4:17 170:15	31st 171:8	274:4,18	8th 13:13 15:4	175:25 192:1
	172:3			
170:19	38 4:11,11	275:22 276:7	24:25 95:14	234:5,11
227 4:18 175:3	384 95:11	277:5	96:1 98:24	235:17 236:10
175:7,19	386 90:4,9	6:42 276:11	102:15 104:13	269:23 271:23
228 4:19 178:22		60 255:8,9,21	104:24 105:10	9:06 212:9
179:5	4	60-53 252:20	149:13 150:7	9:20 212:12
229 4:20 184:13		60-54 125:3	150:10,12,21	9:31 220:16
184:20,22	4th 159:14	126:13 130:19	150:22 151:3	9:38 220:19
185:1,14,21	164:2,8 189:11	134:8 252:20	152:3 153:1,16	9:44 81:14
186:21	4:03 206:15	259:17	154:7,11,12	82:20
	4:27 179:13			
23 158:6	4:29 48:11	62.3 241:6	155:7 156:6,9	9:58 83:16
23rd 282:8	4:37 48:14	65 142:9 243:21	157:2,8 234:5	90 114:2
230 4:21 187:23	40 32:5 140:20	255:8	234:6 235:17	91 162:22
188:2,5,6	148:11	67.6 241:6	236:10 241:4	96 138:3 145:4,5
231 4:22 193:12	41 206:3,9	69 191:16,19	269:16,18,23	145:12 146:1
193:16	414 282:23		270:21 271:17	237:9,12,13,15
232 4:23 205:21	43 8:16 10:11,18	7	271:22 272:7	240:4,6 242:5
205:25		7 4:3 139:15	8:00 138:25	269:5
233 4:24 264:8	80:9 120:23	141:11 200:25	8:15 175:9	99 116:7,8
264:23 265:3	135:22 150:12	201:15,24	178:20	119:14
266:8 267:17	150:14,15	201.13,24	8:20 179:2	110.11
267:18	152:3 158:10		8:42 77:19	
	202:3 237:17	7th 205:11		
234 4:25 188:5	255:21 256:4	7/12/11 4:13	78:21 80:19	
273:20 278:4,5	44 158:10 202:3	7/13/11 4:15	80 114:2	
24th 166:11	45 271:21	7:25 149:19	81 4:13,13	
206:14	46 206:10 207:4	7:37 149:22	265:14	
24/7 74:5	49 206:3 208:15	70 142:8,10,15	83 4:14,14	
25 49:20	200.0 200.10	142:20 143:11	839 3:7 280:22	
25th 117:5	5	143:16 241:7	85 4:15,15	
120:14,17,22		242:7	87 253:24	
25,000 153:20	5th 189:11	72 249:3		
26 71:2 248:14	5:27 87:8	7609 3:23	9	
26th 70:18	5:48 87:13		9 9:11 10:5,7	
	50 118:9,14	281:13		
221:8,9	119:10 142:12	77 4:12	11:2 25:9	
264 4:6,24	143:25	780 2:25 3:4	104:6 120:13	
265 4:24	53 255:9	280:7,19	121:3,13	
269 4:7	53202 3:5,8,13	7857 3:17 281:7	125:12 132:16	
271-4466	3:20 280:20,23		132:18,21	
282:23	281:3,10	8	150:14 175:23	
273 4:25	53562 3:24	8 9:11 10:5,7	196:1,13,19,24	
274 4:25		11:2 85:25	212:20 213:5,6	
28 179:13	281:14	86:5 104:6	213:9,20,23,25	
29th 181:16	53707-7857	120:13 121:3	214:3,6 217:12	
188:20 189:9	3:17 281:7	120:13 121:3	217:13,19	
100.20 107.7		121.13 130.14	411.10,19	
1				l .